



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	Research paper

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	1.The use of the English language is unsatisfactory on a number of occasions and this needs to be addressed in order for the manuscript to be considered presentable. 2. Line 88: Is it of particular importance to mention the exact date on which this operation was undertaken, given that no dates were mentioned in other instances? 3. Reference style is not according to author guidelines, both in text and in bibliography.	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript has been well put together in terms of its scientific merits. The objectives are well articulated and the research design is quite sound as a vehicle to address these objectives. The results have been objectively evaluated and discussed. It is a study of special significance in the agricultural sector as is reflected in the conclusion section.	All the suggestions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the text.