



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>The authors accentuated the results to show off mediocre improvements as breakthrough improvements. The truth is that there was substantial variation from year to year and hydrogen cyanamide + mineral oil was most of the times and for most parameters better than the Bluprins plus nitrogen fertilizers treatments. As an example, see fruit production per tree in tables 7 and 8, where the 3% + 3% + 3% treatment was great for Gala the 2 out of 3 years, but nothing for Fuji for 3 years.</p> <p>I believe that the authors must not give this clear conclusion but give more attention to variations from year to year (why did these happen? Where are the meteo data per year? Where is the discussion for the yearly variation?) and what is the difference from cultivar to cultivar? No discussion was present on these. And at the end you recommend its use.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>L24 break L79-80 how do you set 'dormancy breaking'? L86 correct the '... analysis were ...' L119 remove 'in' from 'in a few days' L127 ... provided ..., but better '... resulted in ...'. Also, L130 needs improvement L148 improve the sentence L199, 206 DADB L226-231 which is the parameter discussed? You have many points in the results section that the parameter compared is not present, which makes the sentences vague. L232 where are the results for fruit set? L243-244 what does the sentence mean? There is partial comparison. L250-251 there is no comment for 2016-17 data from table 7 L281 'e' to 'and' L284 What is the meaning of the sentence? L296 no capitals in the words of title</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | | |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name: | George Nanos |
| Department, University & Country | University of Thessaly, Greece |