



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43852
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of different coatings and storage temperatures in the quality guava powder-crop
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	TOPIC: This topic “Influence of different coatings and storage temperatures in the quality guava powder-crop” does not give comprehensive meaning to the reader. I then suggest an alternative one viz; “Influence of different coatings and storage temperatures on the quality of guava fruits” ABSTRACT: The whole abstract needs to be re-presented in a clear and comprehensive form. It is full of grammatical errors and this errors needs to be taken care of. In line 8, this ought to be known by author that it is only the scientific names that should be italicized. INTRODUCTION: Apart from grammatical blunders, this introduction is not articulated; therefore, serious major revision is required for the manuscript to be alright for publication. MATERIALS AND METHODS: This should be written as “MATERIALS AND METHODS” not “MATERIAL AND METHODS”. In line 65, is it normal to write it as “2% (m/v)” or 2 % (w/v)? I think the normal one should be the latter. Author should understand that this section should be made comprehensive enough. This section needs to be revisited again for comprehensiveness. For if this section is not understood, the results will be meaningless. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: In Table 2, did the author want to write “meansquares” instead of “medium square”? Please reconcile. Again, author needs to explain abbreviations used in Tables under each Table concerned.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line 134-141 “Results fellow creatures were found for [19] where they observed brightness of 65,00, after 15 days of storage under cooling in the guava fruits 'Paluma' submitted to the covering the starch base for 2%. [30] when studying guava covered with eatable covering to the base of O-carboximetilquitosana and essential oil of oregano (<i>Origanum vulgare</i>), it observed that the coverings were efficient and they contributed to the preservation expresses of the fruits presenting an intense shine in all surface expresses (peel), confirming that the total covering of the fruits provided prolongation of the useful life of the guavas after 17 days of storage.” This sentence is too long. It can be modified and broken into smaller pieces to make it more meaningful. This applies to many other sentences in the results section too. Tables 3, 4, 6 and 7 are not statistically explicit enough. Which of the letters is author considering? Lower case or upper case letters? However, this not how the letters should be presented. Please author needs to clarify this. Did author run statistical analysis at all? Author should understand that in presenting results, values in the tables are needed for explanation. These are then compared whether they are statistically different or not from one another. But here author was explaining Tables without mentioning values along. When presenting Tables, three major horizontal lines are needed. There are a lot of grammatical blunders which need to be corrected.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	-Author needs to make his idea understood. -Grammatical errors are too many in the whole text.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. A. Ganiyu
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Kashere, Nigeria