

Editor's comment :

I carefully analyzed this paper and opinions of the reviewers. The biggest objections had the first reviewer. The authors responded to each reviewer's remark, but I think that some of the explanations that the authors gave to this reviewer should be written in the text of the paper.

For example:

1. Why this peach variety has been selected (this should be added to the paper);
2. What is considered a good percentage of survival (80% - this should also be added in the paper to be clear to everyone, not just the reviewer);
3. What is assumed under controlled conditions (add to text of paper)
4. So, all clarifications given to the reviewer should be added to the text of the paper (especially items number 1, 6, 7, 9, 15).

Author's feedback :

1. It was added in the Introduction the information that justifies the use of Precocinho cultivar in this experiment.
2. It has been added in Results and Discussion information related to this affirmation.
3. Information regarding controlled laboratory conditions has been added in the Introduction with their respective citation.
4. Item 1 of the first reviewer, the explanation has already been given in the letter in response to the reviewer. The reviewer asks if they are 4 treatments with PPM, 4 without PPM and 1 control. We respond that there is no control. There are 4 treatments without PPM and 5 treatments with PPM.

The other clarifications, as suggested, were added in the text of the article. All highlighted in yellow.

Bibliographical references have been added to complement the information included in the text. They are highlighted in yellow in the References section. The numbering of the references has also been rearranged as the changes.