



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_48019</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Intensity of Pruning With and Without Detachment in Fig Plants in the Semiarid Potiguar</b>
Type of the Article	<b><u>Original Research Article</u></b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b>                      Modify the objective as "objective to evaluate the intensity of pruning, with and without detachment of fig plants for the purpose of improving the physical, chemical and productive Characteristics of the fig tree in the semi-arid region of Brazil?"                      Specify the study area.                      Relocating " the <b>Study Design</b>" within the methodology.                      Specify the statistical analysis applied to the variables.                      Place the "<b>Place and Duration of Study</b>" prior of methodology.                      Lines 22-23: The following paragraph ". The use of pruning intensity and shoot height influenced the physical, chemical and productive Characteristics of the fig tree in the semi - arid region of" is incomplete.                      Keywords: Add the following words: Pruning, physical, chemical Characteristics.</p> <p><b>1. MATERIAL AND METHODS</b></p> <p><b>2.1 Climatic data</b></p> <p>Line 67: change "<b>Climatic data</b>" to "Study area".</p> <p>This section has no information on soil type.</p> <p>Add the surface area under the studio.</p> <p>Report Figure 1 in the body corresponding to "Study area" text.</p> <p><b>2.2 Treatments, experimental design, and plant growth conditions</b></p> <p><b>2.3 Physical and physico -chemical Characteristics</b></p> <p>Line 88: Change "The physico-chemical analyzes" to "The physical-chemical analyzes".</p> <p>To mention the mechanisms,(technical) and tools applied in determining: fruit weight (g), length and diameter of fruits (cm), number of fruits plant<sup>-1</sup>, yield (kg plant<sup>-1</sup>), soluble solids (° Brix) firmness (N), titratable acidity (%) and vitamin C (100 mg<sup>-1</sup> g pulp).</p> <p><b>2.4 Statistical analysis</b></p> <p>Does not specify the SPSS software version used.</p> <p>The statistical analysis is not clear. There are confusions between comparison of means through Tukey and Duncan tests. Not specify which of the variables are subject to these tests.</p> <p><b>2. RESULTS</b></p> <p>Line 98: There are some error in the expression of the value of probability.</p>	



	<p>Line 99: It is important to mention the value of "F" and their probability for the following variables: fruit mass, fruit length and diameter, firmness, soluble solids, titratable acidity and vitamin C, which were not detected the effect of different intensity of pruning applied. The same for Lines 100-101: for the total number of fruits plant variables and overall plant<sup>-1</sup>.</p> <p>In the results section, does not respect the numerical order of the presentation of the tables. The text presents first the results of Table 3 and then the results of Table 1.</p> <p>Add to the values corresponding to the results of Tables 1 and 2 (MF, Length, Diameter, Firm SS, TA and Vitamin C,) the standard deviation. It is important to specify similar groups (homogeneous) and heterogeneous groups corresponding to Tukey and Duncan tests.</p> <p>In interpreting the results of Tables 1 and 2, when referring to variables with significant or not significant differences, it is important in these cases, to express both the F values and their corresponding value of probability.</p> <p>Lines 160-163 and 173: change figure legends 2, 3, 4 and 5 from Spanish to English.</p> <p>The results on the total number of fruits and the total production plant<sup>1</sup> (table 3) lack the statistical support (standard deviation).</p> <p><b>4. DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>Lines 227-228: Change "These same physical characteristics (weight and length of fruits) Were Studied by [17] "to" The physical characteristics of fig (weight and length of fruits) Were Studied by Rodrigues et al., [17] ".</p> <p>Line 231: Specify "The Values Obtained ..."</p> <p>Line 231: Change "The Values Obtained in the present work are similar to Those found by [6]," to "The Values Obtained in the present work are similar to Those found by Carvalho et al, [6]."</p> <p>Line 235: Change "According to [6] the .." to "According to Carvalho et al, [6] the ...."</p> <p>Line 239: Specify Which results.</p> <p>Lines 242: Write the following sentence correctly "found (by Who?) [14] found (Repeated word) average values of firmness for fig fruits of 10,58N ...</p> <p>Lines 242-246: redraft paragraph correctly ..</p> <p>Line 248: Change "These are differences explained by [6]" to "These are differences explained by Carvalho, et al, [6]..."</p> <p>Lines 250-252: Poor writing. Change "The values found for titratable acidity here are similar to the values found by [12] that ranged from 0.20% to 0.23% when the plants at different times were pruned. While [17] obtained results inferior " to " The values of titratable acidity are similar to the values found by Goncalves et al., [12] That ranged from 0.20% to 0.23% When the plants Were pruned at different times. While, Rodrigues et al., [17] Obtained.... ".</p> <p>In the discussion when some author stated is important to mention the</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>corresponding name followed by the number of the reference (eg lines 242, 248, 250, 252, 254.259, 264, 268, 272, 275, 279, 286, 300, 307 and more).</p> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS</b></p> <p>The bottom line is deficient and little information.</p> <p>In summary, the present manuscript is not properly structured. The document contains too many misspellings and wording. It is a mixture of Portuguese, Spanish and English. There are methodological objections, interpretation of results, objections in the discussions. Under the current scheme, the manuscript cannot be considered for publication. It requires a total restructuring under good writing of a person speaking English.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Line 26: change "(Ficus carica L.)" to (<i>Ficus carica</i> L.).</p> <p>Line 28: presenting author citations in order of consecutive numbers (starting with number 1).</p> <p>Line 28: change "According to data from [13]" to "According to data from IBGE, [13],"</p> <p>Lines 36-39: numbers errors both in redaction and spelling. For example:</p> <p>The text mentions "In the production of production, an intensity of poda (WHAT IS THE poda? Pruning ???), is one of the factors external Which higher influenciã (INFLUENCE ???) in production and quality of the same to the same, the same to the same That ????????? " "</p> <p>Lines 40-42: There are few errors in writing with repeated words.</p> <p>Line 42: change "Which according to [4] is one of ..." to "Which according to Campagnolo, [4] is one of ... ".</p> <p>In short, the introduction is not properly structured. There are numerical disorder to mention the authors, and many and misspellings error.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In summary, the present manuscript is not properly structured. The document contains too many misspellings and wording. It is a mixture of Portuguese, Spanish and English. There are methodological objections, interpretation of results, objections in the discussions. Under the current scheme, the manuscript cannot be considered for publication. It requires a total restructuring under good writing of a person speaking English.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rahim Foroughbakhch</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mexico</b>