

### **Editor's Comment:**

I have reviewed the manuscript, the reviewers comments and the revision.

Unfortunately, the statistical analysis added is neither sufficient nor fully appropriate.

In particular:

1. the figures 1 - 4 all include the data for the check (no treatment) but this data is missing from table 3.
2. The statistical analysis appears to be comparisons across the rows, namely the differences between the values for different days within a treatment and not differences between treatments. Since the primary purpose of the manuscript is to demonstrate differences resulting from various treatments this is not appropriate.

The comparisons between the treatments and the check are as important as the differences observed between the various experimental treatments for interpreting the need for the treatments.

3. There are still issues with the clarity of the prose. One example in section 3.1 the clarity of the sentence:

decreased with the increase of the treatment time, and the fresh weight of the ..  
needs to be modified to

decreased with the increase of the treatment time, and **the reduction in** the fresh weight of the...  
inorder for it to make sense.

### **Author's Feedback:**

Thanks a lot for your comments.

For question 1: Figures 1-4, including control and treatments, were designed to show that the two preservative formulations were superior to the control. But table 3 was to compare the differences between the two treatments and select a formula for practical application, so table 3 was not added to the control.

For question 2: We re-analyzed the differences between the treatments.

For question 3: In addition to the questions mentioned by the editor, we also proofread the full text and highlighted in yellow colour.