

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_105181
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of a Hydrothermal Treatment to Control Fruit Flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) and Maintain the Fruit Quality of 'Fuyu' Persimmons
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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fruit flies are the main pest of the global fruit crop due to the direct damage they cause, and to their ability to adapt to regions they are introduced to; they became one of the greatest obstacles to the commercialization of fresh fruit in international trade. Therefore, the research for finding an effective pest control methods is definitely has great importance for scientific community. 2. Overall the title of the manuscript seems good however the suggested change may be accommodating (please refer to reviewed manuscript). 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive however, for minor correction I refer you to reviewed manuscript. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references of the manuscript are sufficient 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language quality is suitable.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is well written.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bilqees Fatima
Department, University & Country	Minhaj University, Pakistan