

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85922
Title of the Manuscript:	POSTHARVEST CONSERVATION OF 'THOMSON' PITAYA AS A FUNCTION OF STORAGE TEMPERATURE
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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 article appears well written, and results discussed appropriately. However, some compulsory revisions required: Key words: key word needs to be given appropriately. Objective of study given in introduction section needs revisions in light of the technical programme of the study. References: some references require mandatory revisions	Dear reviewer, we appreciate your contributions. The suggested revisions were accepted and are highlighted in the text. Keywords were adjusted, as suggested by the reviewer. The objective was revised and adapted with the introduction of the manuscript. The references were adjusted according to the journal's rules
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Aim of study must be clearly defined as per technical programme of study. The wiretap with respect to replications and treatments needs relooked. Materials methods: revisions required with respect to statistical details. Results and discussion: results need to be elaborated at some sections.	Abstract: The objective was adequate according to the reviewer's suggestions. The individual fruit was taken as replication unit, constituting total replications of 4 x 4=16 per treatment. To clarify, we added the following sentence to the text: The individual fruit was taken as replication unit, constituting total replications of 4 x 4. As suggested by the reviewer, we changed the writing in some sections of the discussion, seeking to improve the reading and comprehension of the text.
Optional/General comments	Botanical name of crop may be added in the title.	We've added the crop's botanical name to the title as requested.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.