



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45666
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF 1-METHYLCYCLOPROPENE (1-MCP) CONCENTRATIONS ON THE PHYSICAL QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO VARIETIES OF PLANTAIN STORED UNDER THREE RIPENING STAGES
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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	1) Page 1 Keywords:....., chlorophyll and pulp} change to :....., chlorophyll and pulp] 2) Conclusion: Authors should write more details about the application of 1-MCP with packaging to all three ripening stages of two plantains gave the same or difference responses. 3) Page 15 Reference number 10 Kandungan.....(Mangifera Indica change to(<i>Mangifera indica</i> 4) Page 15 Reference number 18 no page number? 5) Page 15 Reference number 21 (Persea americana change to (<i>Persea Americana</i> 6) Page 15 Reference number 32 (Carica papaya change to <i>Carica papaya</i> 7) Page 15 Reference number 32 there is no detail about this reference	Correction made in revised paper Correction made in revised paper Correction made in revised paper Proper reference used and Correction made in revised paper
Optional/General comments	Page 4: Since Fig 1 to Fig 3, why X-axis or Time (Days) the recording times are not the same? Page 12, Fig 13: the results are conflict with Fig 9. From Fig 9 indicated that NoP gave the minimal fruit firmness but Fig 13, NoP remained the maximal pulp firmness?.Authors should discussion in this section.	Not same because, the individual effects (1-mcp concentration, packaging and variety all had effect on time. The interactions were not significant then. Those figures are removed.

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)	