



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18239
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenological cycles, thermal time and growth curves of mango fruit cultivars in subtropical conditions
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	The manuscript contains important data on temperature effect on mango growth and fruit-related characteristics. The manuscript text is comprehensively written, all data are well presented in the form of figures and tables with adequate statistical treatment, and clear conclusions are stated. I have only minor comments on the manuscript. In the reference list, write "References" as a heading. Correct the format of all references in the manuscript and the reference list according to the journal's instructions. In the reference list, remove the reference "Silva 1996" since it is not cited in the manuscript text. In contrast, add the reference "Ventura et al. 2005" which is cited on line 218 and which is missing in the reference list. In the legend to Figure 2, line 253, add the corresponding reference to part (C) of the figure after the word "format" in the figure legend, i.e., "Figure 2. Longitudinal diameter (A), transverse diameter (B) and format (C) of mango fruit...." Minor comments throughout the text: Abstract, line 9: Add a space between the words "their" and "productive" and between the words "phonological" and "performance" Keywords, line 23: Add a space between the two plant scientific names "<i>Mangifera indica</i>" Introduction, line 45: Write "As Souza et al. (2009) stated" - i.e., add a verb here Line 51: Insert a space between the words "Cuiabana" and "lowland"	<i>Firstly, thank the reviewer's suggestions.</i> <i>The citations and references were corrected according to the journal's instructions. The reference "Ventura et al. 2005" was wrong, the correct is "Ventura et al. 2014", it has been corrected. The reference "Smith 1996" has been removed.</i> <i>The legend of Figure 2 has been corrected according to the reviewer's suggestion.</i> <i>All the words that were together were separated according to the recommendation of the reviewer. The verb "Stated" was added as suggested and the</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 53: Correct the spelling of the word “fenologiadas” - it should probabaly mean “phenology” Material and methods, line 82: Insert a space between the words “between” and “anthesis” Line99: Insert a space between a number and corresponding unit in “2 m” Results and Discussion Line 129: Correct the spelling in the word “completely” (not “completly”) Line 138: Insert a space between the words “phonological” and “stages” Line 143: Insert a space between the words “an” and “average” Line 206: Insert the word “cultivar” in the sentence “..evaluate the performance of the same cultivar” - a noun should be added here Line 215: Insert a space between the words “threeû and “mango” Line 221: Insert a comma after the words “Only in the second phase,...” Line 238: Insert a space between the words “behaviour” and “for”	word “fenologiadas” was changed to “phenology”. The addition of spaces between words was also performed on materials and methods section as suggested. In the results and discussion section, the spaces between the words were added. The other suggestions were made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I checked the original manuscript and the words in it together and highlighted by the reviewer were not together. Therefore, I believe that this has happened for a problem in the file at the time of submission. So I warn of the possibility to occur this again after resubmit the manuscript with corrections.