

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87551
Title of the Manuscript:	Preharvest Foliar Applied Salicylic Acid and Calcium Chloride Affects Postharvest Storability and Bio-chemical Quality of Pear (<i>Pyrus communis</i> L.) cv. Carmen Fruits
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	For the TSS value, obtained data in the manuscript and Fig. 2 is not the match, Are the data obtained accurate? The evaluation time listed in Table 1 is incorrect; for reducing sugars, obtained data in the manuscript and Table 1 is not the match. There is confusion between reducing sugars and total sugars, the author should be rechecked it for accuracy.	
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript contains some grammatical errors that need to be addressed. In the abstract section, "pre-harvest pre-harvest foliar application" added pre-harvest, correct to "pre-harvest foliar application", and "7 14 and 21 days" to "7, 14 and 21 days". In the material and methods section, "salicylic acid and calcium chloride (CaCl ₂)" was combined treatment or alone treatment, the author should be described it in more detail. How many fruits are harvested per tree? Harvested time of pear 'Carmen', foliar spray time needs to be added in the manuscript. "titrable acidity" to "titratable acidity" in the whole manuscript. "by [17]", not bold, correct to by [17]. In my opinion, the % symbol has a space and must go next to the value in the whole manuscript. Axis titles of Fig. 2 are not correct, "physiological loss in weight (%)" to "fruit firmness (kg/cm ²)". "kg/cm" to "kg/cm ² " in the whole manuscript. "storage highest total soluble solid" to "storage, the highest total soluble solid". Review the title of the Figure and Table, English needs to be improved. "SSC content" should replace "TSS content". "CaCl ₂ treatment would" to "CaCl ₂ treatment would". "commercial distribution.." to "commercial distribution." The presentation of citations in the manuscript has not been consistent, for example (Attri <i>et al.</i> [34]) with (Ibadullah <i>et al</i> [35]), Attri <i>et al</i> [34] "8.04 mg/100" to "8.04 mg/100 g". For the References part, the author needs to revise for consistency, Journal titles are abbreviated, italicized, or not? For example, references 1, 12, etc., In my opinion, the word DOI: should be removed.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tran Dinh Manh
Department, University & Country	Thu Dau Mot University, Vietnam