



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38512
Title of the Manuscript:	Budbreak promoters increases percentage, standardization and synchrony of budbreak in 'Eva' and 'Castel Gala' apple trees in mild winter climate conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Title Revisit the aticle title. It should not be the conclusion of the study, but what is intended to evaluated. The title should be the same as the aim: Evaluation of the effect of different budbreak promoters on apple cultivars ‘Eva’ and ‘Castel Gala’ in mild winter climate conditions. Abstract Rewrite the abstract by excluding all bold subtitles e.g. aims, study design etc. For example: Write one introductory sentence. The aim of this study.....This research was carried out...Experimental design..... Three treatments were..... Add a sentence on how the data was analysed.....All treatments reduced blooming period.... The combination of Erger..... Introduction Line 29: Reference Cook, 2010 does not appear on reference list. Line 23: Change the word:” ...chimical To chemical. Line 33: Reference: “.....Mohamed 2008”: include a comma between the author and the year. Line 36: Reference: “.....Hato 2009...”: include a comma between the author and the year. Line 44: Put spacing between increase and research: “....yield increases,reseatch...” Materials and Methods Line 50: “....during the 2014/2015....” Why the experimental period differs from the one (2012/2013) indicated on the abstract? Line 50 and 53: ° appear underlined e.g. line 50: 31 °52’S... Remove the underline. Line 53: Remove spacing “.....80.7 % ...” to 80.7% Line 57: Change “..... trees ha-1...” to tree ha⁻¹ Line 66: Remove spacing “.....7.2 °C...” to 7.2°C... Line 70: Change “.....wind speed not exceeding 7km-1.....” to.....7km⁻¹... Line 83: “....the fruits were harvested in January 6....” What year did the fruits were harvested? Include the year of harvesting. Results and Discussion Lines 101, 104, 105 and 106: The same comment as on Line 83 applies for these four lines. Line 113: “....occurred one day....” Change to 1 day.... For consistence with other sections that indicate days. References Line 206: The listed reference does not appear in the text.	accepted review I excluded the subtitles in bold, but I think that in the abstract, an introductory sentence is not necessary, which is addressed in the introduction, and how the data were analyzed is well described in the material and methods. Thus, the abstract can become very extensive, exceeding the limit of words. reference adds to reference list accepted review accepted review accepted review accepted review In the abstract, I confused myself in writing. The experimental period was corrected in the abstract. I didn't find underline in this sentence accepted review accepted review accepted review accepted review accepted review accepted review The listed reference was added to the manuscript in the section Material and Methods
Minor REVISION comments	Minor editorial comments as indicated on compulsory review section.	
Optional/General comments	None	