



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17846
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbohydrate concentration in 'BRS Rubimel' peach trees during the annual cycle
Type of the 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	The manuscript is good in terms of determination of the Carbohydrate concentration in 'BRS Rubimel' peach trees during the annual cycle. Generally, the overall manuscript is clear. Title The title of the paper is concise and informative. Abstract The ABSTRACT indicates the main topics and results. Tables and figures -The tables and figures have clear message, but, each table and each figure have to be self understandable. The reader should get a first impression of the relevance of a contribution only by studying the tables and figures, and without reading the paper sections (Table 1: Ar, Art and Sac??). Introduction The introduction is not motivating. I am interested in the impact of the study and how it advances our knowledge; the author was silent on the implications of the study. Materials & methods Technically I feel that the data was adequately obtained and analyzed. Please clearly develop and discuss the experimental objectives and justify why you chose the selected method to achieve your objective;	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results & Discussion The arguments and discussion in the paper are technically valid. Conclusion Please discuss the results very well and compare the results with other studies conducted by international researchers. The results presented in the conclusion have not been sufficiently described. References • Lines from 24 to 28: add a reference • Lines 35 to 42 : please add a reference Punctuation Please check the manuscript carefully for the correction errors on : punctuation errors, some unclear sentences, For these reasons, I invite you to revise your manuscript	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		