



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44278
Title of the Manuscript:	Post-Harvest Quality Of The Papaya 'Golden' Submitted Different Biodegradable Coatings And Conditions Of Storage
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title suggested: Post harvest quality of Golden papay by using different biodegradable caotings and storing conditions Grammar and sense on Line 57:.. has the objective to assess..conservation power???? Rewrite it..not very clear.. Do not bold titles from your tables. References: name them in the original language. No need to add language at the end of the author reference. Do not underline or bold fonts. Add date of access to a website. Use the same font. Grammar on conclusion: Potato starch coating at 2%. And the cooling treatment... potentiated better its efficiency than the other storing treatments...	I title was it modified according to the reviewer's suggestion The objective of the work (line 57) it was rewritten becoming clear and comprehensible. All of the references were nominated according to the original language The grammar of the manuscript was properly corrected by specialized company in translation.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Not

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>