



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion sections need to be rewritten. Most of the sentences do not make sense. Some of the sentences contain Portuguese instead of English (e.g. line 80) No scientific names are given (e.g. peach, apple, pear etc) Choose one of the references (e.g. Quick and Schaffer, 1996, cited by CARVALHO and ZANETTE, 2004). Flore and Laine (1996), cited by Marafon et al. (2007), Sauter and Kloth (1987), cited by Rodrigues et al. (2006) etc) It looks like the Brazilian article was put in Google translator and copied pasted.	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References were not according to the guidelines of the journal. Please put numbers instead of names in the text. References instead of Referencias	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		