



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48330
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT BANANA 'PRATA-ANÃ' BUNCH AGES ON POST-HARVEST QUALITY
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 Comentários obrigatórios da REVISÃO	<p>This work reports interesting data related to banana maturity. Abstract needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>General objective and/or Study Design, should remark how the achievement of ideal harvest is going to be measured.</p> <p>I have count 9 methods in this work and none of them are specified in the abstract. So, parts written in Methodology can be omitted (most of them are repeated in the section Materials and Methods) and the authors should report the name of the chemical and physical methods applied in this abstract section. In this sense you can read the articles abstracts: Saengrayap, R., Rattanakaran, J., Chaiwong, S. Maturity prediction of banana with different bunch cover materials using artificial neural networks(2018) Acta Horticulturae, 1210, pp. 213-220; and Laylieam, S., Kosittrakun, M. Effects of harvest maturity on banana quality (1998) Journal of Food Quality, 21 (6), pp. 539-544.</p> <p>I wonder if the storage conditions (lines 62-69) are the same post-harvest conditions before distributing them to the market. If so, the conclusions section should specified that bunches from 16-week were the best for those specific conditions.</p> <p>Materials and methods can be divided in subsections: Sample treatments and every particular chemical and physical method performed.</p> <p>Line 131, Move Figure 1 to a previous line 128, for example.</p> <p>It should help the understanding of color by CIELab measurements if authors explain/detail Hue and Chroma with their formulas implying L, a and b coordinates.</p>	<p>The summary and all necessary corrections have been made and reviewed.</p> <p>The ideal harvesting point will be analyzed from the results of the physical and chemical analyzes of the fruits and based on these results identify the best harvesting season, as the correction was done in the objective.</p> <p>The methods used in the abstract were specified.</p> <p>The post-coleite storage conditions were $10^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ and relative humidity of $90\% + 5\%$ for 25 days. These conditions are the same for all bunch ages before distributing them to the market. I have specified in the conclusions the storage conditions for the bunches harvested at 16 weeks, which are actually the same for the other ages as well.</p> <p>Subdivision of material and methods was done.</p> <p>Formulas and explanations of the interpretation of the coordinates L, a, b, were added to further detail Hue and Chroma.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>English and misprints in text have to be reviewed. For example, in first line in Methodology (Abstract), and some words are joined (lines 12, 29, 30, 35, 67, 277...)</p> <p>Some legends are repeated (lines 175, 186, 252, 264, 293). The beginning g of a sentence is missed (line 253).</p>	<p>A review of English, misprints and words was made.</p> <p>Repeated captions were removed</p> <p>Corrected the miss of a lost statement, with the exclusion of a text box in place.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>This work measuring banana maturity parameters is quite interesting. The authors should reorganize the abstract and focus better the conclusions. Also, discussion comments could be added after reading the two references I recommend.</p>	

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)	

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>