



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48286
Title of the Manuscript:	INDUCTION OF SENESCENCE AND FOLIAR ABSCISSION IN APPLE TREES WITH THE USE OF ABSCISIC ACID
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	<p>This manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has good support statistical. The variables evaluated were adequate. Little errors were observed during the revision.</p> <p>Title: Is ok.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add information about productivity in both varieties. 2. Some corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is ok. Only add the economic importance of apple production in Brazil (acreage, yield, total production and production value). 2. Little corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Materials and methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add agronomic characteristics of 'Daiane' and 'Fuji Suprema' apple varieties. 2. Is very important add chill hours accumulated during both years. 3. Little corrections were done in the manuscript. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference Meyer [23] line 149 must be Meyer et al. 2. Is important to show the production in both cultivars. 3. Tables and Figures are clear and the results are good with proper evidences. 4. Little corrections were done inside manuscript <p>Conclusion: Is ok.</p> <p>Reference: Are complete Corrections were done in accordance with rules of this journal (Check manuscript).</p>	<p>The necessary adjustments were made, information related to the Brazilian production of apples and the cultivars used in this study were added. All the corrections proposed by the reviewers have been complied with.</p> <p>The authors are grateful for the valuable contribution received.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	