



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_37717
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and quality of jelly palm fruits submitted to Neem oil
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The following info is lacking in the manuscript. 1. What are the insects found feeding on the plant during the study? 2. What is the per cent infestation? 3. What are the symptoms of damage? 4. What is the role of their attack on the loss of yield? 5. How neem oil is related to physiology of the palm fruits? 6. Any biochemical relataions are reported on this aspect 7. The attribution given in lines- 216 to 221 are vague and appears to be virtual. Science needs realistic things. 8. Info in the lines 231 to 232 needs clarity on the role of neem oil on the enhancement of anthocyanins production. 9. Line 295- no lesions---. What insect was responsible for making the lesions? 10. Line 299. Without knowing / observing the insect feeding on the fruit, how can we attribute the reduction to neem oil? 11. Line 345- Physicochemical attributes that are influenced by neem oil need to be specified. 12. Ref 5 in line 367-369 does not pertain to this article. 13. Whether Irapua bee is a pest of Jelly palms? If so what is its reported incidence and infestation? All the above need to be answered for consideration of the paper for publication.	1. The insects (<i>Pachymerus nucleorum</i>) find and attack the palm fruits, locally known as butiá (<i>Butia odorata</i>). Based on this, we counted the fruits attacked. Insects like <i>Homalinotus coriaceus</i> find and attack the flowers, thus the effective fruition of the bunches was carried out, but it was not determined if this was the only insect, there are others that attack the flowers, and also because it is afield experiment. 2. Based on the suggestion, the percentage of fruits attacked was added in table 2. 3. Based on the suggestion, the information was added in the materials and methods and figure 1, demonstrating the symptom of insect attack on the fruits. 4. As suggested, a reduction in infestation levels and their relation to the control (T1) was added to table 2, as well as generic productivity data collected in the experimental field. 5. Neem oil can be considered as a natural insecticide extracted from the seeds of <i>Azadirachta indica</i>, when used in the experiment we evaluated and observed its interference in post-harvest physiology. However, it would be an interesting point for the next study whether or not enzymatic interference of the oil in the fruits occurred. 6. We report the physicochemical changes of the fruits in relation to the use of Neem oil. Since the <i>Butia odorata</i> plant has limited literature, we compare the color of the fruits with other authors that prove this influence and the relation of the coloration of the fruits with the existence of bioactive compounds. 7. This was removed from the text as suggested. 8. As suggested, the paragraph was rewritten more clearly 9. The insect <i>Pachymerus nucleorum</i> causes damage to the fruits and bunches. 10. As suggested, we added table 2 and figure 1 with the symptoms of the lesions and the pest that caused them. The reduction in the observed damages was attributed to the use of Neem oil as the main differentiating factor among the treatments. 11. As suggested the conclusions were rewritten more completely. 12. The reference of line 367-369 was excluded from the manuscript. 13. In this experiment, the quantification of the damages caused was only performed in the fruits, and not the flowers. But as mentioned in the manuscript, there are reports of the insect Irapua (<i>Trigonas pinipes</i>) and the beetle (<i>Homalinotus coriaceus</i>) causing damage to the flowers of <i>Butia odorata</i>, while the insect <i>Pachymerus nucleorum</i> causes damage to the fruits. The damage caused by <i>Pachymerus nucleorum</i> is easier to observe during the experiment, which allowed its quantification.
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical mistakes and typing mistakes need to be corrected- line 373, 374, 16. Information in the lines of 270-274 is a repetition. Needs to take care.	Typing errors have been corrected. They are in yellow.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The paper has no scientific base. The results appear to be vague and lack of clarity in explanation.	Repetition has been corrected; more care will be taken in the next manuscripts. Since <i>Butia odorata</i> is a native culture and difficult to handle and manage, we try to carry out practices with organic products that are easy to handle for small and medium-sized farmers, also because the crop does not have products registered with surveillance agencies. We prioritize the basic data, as these are of great interest to the producer, and serve as a basis for future work with this palm tree. Given the suggestion, we have tried to improve the writing of the results and explain the discussion better, adding some data that was missing, in order to improve the understanding on the subject.
---	---	--