



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18194
Title of the Manuscript:	DORMANCY BREAKING OF THE FIG TREE WITH HYDROGEN CYANAMIDE AND GARLIC EXTRATE
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 29: what do you mean by undemand? Line 44: it should be which conditions. Line 67: You cited Sagredo et al. 2013 in the introduction. This is not found in reference section but Sagredo et al. 2005. To be checked out In the introduction there is no consistency in the way you cited authors, some are in capital letter while others are not, why? Line 97: the year of the publication should be written after Köppen The author did not tell us how the hydrogen cyanamide were applied to the plants in the methodology What is the name of the software used for the analysis of variance?	line 29: the sentence was rewritten with a purpose to the better understanding; line 44: it was made the conditions required; Line 67: All the references were given according to the author guidelines; line 97The year of the publication was written after Köppen and put in the references; For both hydrogen cyanamide and garlic extract, the application was made with a knapsack sprayer, with 3 liters of solution per plant, with the aid of a plastic curtain, so that there was no driftage. The software used for the analyses of variance was SISVAR (7).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	From line 142 to 144: We suggest the use of garlic extract over that of hydrogen cyanamide due its toxicity instead of what you wrote. Why did you use only 2% hydrogen cyanamide while you varied the doses of garlic extract? If there is any reason it should be stated Line 159: there is a hyperbole “extremely interesting”? How extremely interesting is this compound when we know that it is a toxic compound, and the consumption of the fruit of this treated fig will endanger human health? The data on the tables and graphs are they the average from the two years of the experiment? It should then be stated clearly. In the introduction the author reported that “There are no reports on the use of garlic extract as a sprouting inductor on fig trees under the 84 growing conditions in subtropical climate of the State of São Paulo. So I was expecting his recommendation on that to fig producers in the his conclusion but unfortunately nothing like that.	It was used the hydrogen cyanamide only 2% because of these dose was obtained in previous research (4, 13) and is employed with the fruits grower in the region. Therefore, the garlic extract doses need to break dormancy is unknown and it was the objective of the present article research. The hyberbole was corrected. The data on the tables and graphs was the average from the two years of the experiment. This sentence was stated clearly in the material and methods. The conclusions was rewritten in according to the reviewers suggestions.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	However, some minor errors were noted: In section "Introduction" All references must be given according to Author Guidelines (citations of references in text must be identified using numbers in square brackets) There are some semi colons between authors who published together and even in the reference section which need to be corrected. It should be comma instead of semi colons.	All the references were given according to the author guidelines;
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style.	