



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43649
Title of the Manuscript:	Bluprins® as Alternative Bud Break Promoter for 'Maxi Gala' and 'Fuji Suprema' 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The work is of interest, well written, and provides interesting information about the utilization of Bluprins® as alternative bud break promoter for apple under low chilling accumulation conditions. Bluprins® is an alternative product to replace hydrogen cyanamide, which has high toxicity to the agrochemical applicator and environment. The work comprises four growing season.</p> <p>The results also reflect the differences in behaviour of two different apple varieties.</p> <p>The main difficulty of the work is its statistical analysis. Data should not be presented for each year and for each variety, or for each evaluation dates, unless there is a significant interaction in a multiple ANOVA.</p> <p>A table with the chilling hours accumulated during each month of the winter period and for each year of study would allow a better interpretation of the results. It should be presented in the methodology section.</p> <p>In some cases, the marked differences between treatments are not clearly emphasized in the text.</p> <p>The authors should evaluate if it is necessary to present all the treatments or it is possible to suppress some of them in order to improve the visualization of the results.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The authors did not carry out a multiple analysis because the growing seasons are quite variable in climatic terms, mainly chilling accumulation during the winter. In the same way, the cultivars present different behaviors. There are already several studies in the literature that indicate there is a great variation in the dormancy breaking response between different growing seasons, as well as between different cultivars, since they present different requirements in relation to chilling accumulation. In this sense, it was not the objective of the work to compare different growing seasons or cultivars, but to verify, individually, the effect of treatments on the main cultivars used in Brazil, in growing seasons with different chilling accumulation.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>The authors agreed that all the treatments should be showed in the results section, once it is difficult to supress some of them without miss important information.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		
---	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	