



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38522
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of chemical thinning season using Metamitron on peaches 'Sensação' quality
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I expected all the issues I commented in previous review were addressed; but main issues were not. For example, whether the farmers cropped or not in 2014 is still unidentified. Regarding the conclusion, I'm still not sure why 30 and 60 DAFBs is concluded so that the features are close to that of manual thinning. In L.91, the reason of why the author believes metamitron changes skin color was added; however, the explanation makes no sense for my previous comment. The paragraph should be revised, for example, "In 2015, the skin color of manual thinning and 20DAFB peaches had 5% significant difference with that of 40-60DAFB peaches. The fruits of the plants submitted to manual thinning and to the chemical thinning with metamitron at 20 and 30 DAPF presented a yellow-green color, whereas the plants thinned with metamitron at 40, 50 and 60 DAPF presented a yellow-orange epidermis. However, in 2016, there were no significant difference in the skin color over all thinning methods. It is known that the peaches epidermis color is highly affected by the genotype[15], green pruning management [16] of fruit maturation [17]. Metamitron is expected to act in the electron transport chain, blocking the triplet chlorophyll synthesis that reacts with oxygen, forming singlet oxygen and reactive oxygen species, and consequently promoted pigments destruction[Reference]. {the discussion for the results of 2015, 2016 and their differences}". The discussion should be consistent with that of firmness. They explained "Because there were differences between evaluated crops." So it is possible that that is the reason of significant difference in the color in 2015. There are many difficulties in the revised manuscript. Regarding Fig.1 and 2, there are no s.d. bars. In the figure captions, CV is explained although the values are not presented. In Fig.2, the vertical axis of soluble solids may be preferred to start from zero; but most variables should be presented with box plots. Bar plot is not preferred to pH and Hue. Regarding Fig.1-C, the unit of firmness is "Newton"; that seems strange (N/mm² ?). Additionally, I'm not sure that the values of Hue in the HSB color space should be compared. In our field, the plot of La*b* color space is usually compared because the color space is designed so that the Euclidean distance of two colors in the space indicates the difference of the colors of human sense. At least, Fig.1-A obviously misleads the readers. In conclusion, although I basically think their investigation has a potential to contribute for practical peach production, I cannot recommend to publish the manuscript as a scientific article unless the manuscript is thoroughly revised.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kai Moriguchi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Faculty of agriculture, Shizuoka University, Japan</i>