

Editor's comment :

I have read the manuscript and the reviewers' comments. It should be better written. My comments are below.

The title needs correction – it should be “Post harvest quality ...”

In the objective the acid lime is reported as Tahiti' of the genotype TSKC x (LCR x TR) – 017 while in the title this is referred to the rootstock. What is the right one? In the conclusion there are some abbreviations not mentioned earlier Please correct.

In M&M 2.1 the fruits are not growing, the trees are growing. Please correct.

The substrate used for the growing of trees should be mentioned.

The pH measurement is written twice – please explain better the measurement of hydrogenionic potential (why this is written a HP) and the H⁺ concentration, if you used pH meter the it is pH.

The total phenols and flavonoids should be quantified based on a specific phenolic compound. Which was that?

The method of flavonoid determination should be better written. The juice can not be macerated in a mortar.

Results? There is not a word perspiration!

In Fig 2A the Y axis has wrong title. There is not a interaction of fresh mass loss! It is just fresh mass loss

English should be revised throughout the entire manuscript.

Author's feedback :

Dear Editor, all the suggestions of the paper have been corrected. Thank you so much for the contribution.

1. Post harvest quality of acid lime fruits 'Tahiti' grafted on genotype TSKC x (LCR x TR) – 017, under saline stress.

2. The objective was to verify the post-harvest quality during the storage of the Tahiti acid lime tree grafted on rootstocks irrigated with waters of different salinities.

3. Solids solids ratio with titratable acidity.

4. The trees of acid lime 'Tahiti' were grown in an experimental area.

5. In the planting it was carried out in pits with dimensions of 40 cm in diameter and 40 cm in depth, for which a substrate was prepared with the mixture and 40 L of Neosol Fluvic soil, 20 L of tanned bovine manure and a phosphate fertilization with superimposed. In addition, in order to raise the relative humidity of the air and reduce the albedo, a bed of dry matter from corn and sugarcane ground on the ground was placed.

6. Hydrogen ionic potential: pH was determined with direct reading in the extract in digital potentiometer bench (model DM-22). Concentration of H⁺ ions (μM): estimated from the conversion of the obtained pH values by the equation $[H^+] = 10^{-pH}$.

7. Phenolic compounds (mg 100 mL⁻¹): Were estimated by the method described by Waterhouse [10], from the dilution of 0.5 g of extract to 50 ml of distilled water. From the dilution an aliquot of 400 μL was withdrawn, with the addition of 125 μL of the Folin-Ciocalteu reagent, followed by stirring and standing for 5 minutes. After the reaction time, 250 μL of 20% sodium carbonate was added, followed by further stirring and resting in a water bath (Fisatom model) for 30 minutes at 40 °C. The standard curve was prepared with gallic acid and the readings were performed in a spectrophotometer (model SP-110 Meter) at an absorbance of 765 nm.

8. Flavonoids (mg 100 mL⁻¹) were determined according to the method described by Francis [11], where 1.5 mL of the Tahiti cell juice was used which was macerated with 10 mL of ethanol:HCl and poured into a tube falcon wrapped with foil, the tubes remained refrigerated for 24 hours. After resting,

the samples were filtered using filter paper and the spectrophotometer readings (model SP-110 Meter) at 374 nm.

9. This behavior happens due to the respiration of the fruits throughout the days.

10. Fig. 2. Fresh mass loss (A).

11. English has been revised.