



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40560
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of plant growth regulators in the chemical thinning and return bloom of Eva apple trees
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	Abstract Aims: The aim of this study was to evaluate the effects of the application of different plant growth regulators, namely naphthalene acetic acid (NAA), 6-Benzyladenine (BA) and Promalin® (6- benzyladenine (BA) with the gibberellic acid GA 4+7), on thinning efficacy and return bloom of Eva apple trees. Methodology: Plant growth regulators were applied in both years as follows: Promalin® was sprayed at the full bloom (80%) period at doses of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0 mL L⁻¹; NAA and BA were sprayed in fruits with 5-7 mm diameter, at doses of 5, 10 and 15 mg L⁻¹ and 50, 75, 100 and 125 mg L⁻¹, respectively, and hand fruit thinning was performed after full bloom. <i>The words painted in yellow indicate the deductions. The red color indicates changes.</i> 1. Title can be altered to Thinning of Eva apple with 2. Please find such words which are not in the title, this way search engines of the web will find your manuscript with higher probability. In line 11: Apple can be change as <i>Malus x domestica</i>, chemical thinning can be change crop load, etc. 3. Treatments should be compared unthinned control trees. But author used only a hand fruit thinning. 4. Hand fruit thinning should be use instead of manual thinning 5. Fruit flesh firmness should be use instead of pulp firmness 6. There are some shortcomings in Table 1, Author/authors should be check units. T4 Promalin 1.25 ml L⁻¹ and T4 Promalin 1.75 ml L⁻¹. I didn't understand what is the a-, c-?? I think that there are forgotten letters. They can write ab instead of a-b. The necessary abbreviations at their first mention should be given in parenthesis. Abbreviation explanations as TCSA-Trunk cross sectional area, PF-pulp firmness, TSS-total soluble solids, etc. shouldn't use because of they explained in the material and methods section. 7. In line 126, Author/authors should be use fruit shape instead of fruit format. 8. In line 166, 168 and 169, the first letter of the kilogram will be lowercase, Kg, kg 9. In Table 3, Author/authors should be check units. Table 3 represent second experiment cycle 2013/2014 data not to 2012/2013. 10. Table and figure captions and descriptions should be short, concise and descriptive. Author/authors must be remove T1, T2, T3.....T13 in the table and figure. 11. In Table 2, Treatments must be instead of Treataments, the first letter of the length will be capitalize Length and Table 4, the first letter of the length will be capitalize Length 12. In Figure 1, I think explanations on the figure 1 are Portuguese. They must be English! 13. In material methods section, treatments can be represent in the table.	The changes were made as suggested by the reviewer. Per tree yield and fruit weight in the second year of the trial were lower than the first year of the experiment. What is the reason?? Due to the different climatic conditions in the productive cycles, in the 2013/2014, in the month of December - development of the fruit, the precipitation was below the normal climatological.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Treatments</th><th>Dose</th><th>Application time</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> 14. Per tree yield and fruit weight in the second year of the trial were lower than the first year of the experiment. What is the reason??	Treatments	Dose	Application time																						
Treatments	Dose	Application time																								
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments																										
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I really appreciate the corrections and contributions to the manuscript. Thank you.																								