Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Changes in the content of water-soluble vitamins in Actinidia chinensis during cold storage” (JSCS1494). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing: Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer:

Plant Materials

(1). Response to comment: Line 55, page 4: What was the temperature in cold storage room?

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of the statements of “the temperature in cold storage room?” were corrected as “(1±0.5℃)”

(2). Response to comment: Line 56, page 4: Authors collected samples in three different period. The third period was “edible period” which is usually too long and depend on cultivar. Authors have to explain when fruits were exactly collected in the third point for research (please express in days after fruit harvesting).

Response: Considering the Reviewer’s suggestion, we have tallied the storaged days of 7 cultivars when they are on edible periods, Control(56 days), Wudang-1(61 days), Qihong(61 days), Hongyang(62 days), Cuiyu(81 days), Huayou(71 days), Jingnong-2(61 days).

(3). Response to comment: Line 73, page 5: “Firmness was measured in 5 kiwifruit for each cultivar”. There is no information what replication for statistical analysis was. Please specify!

Response: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that, “firmness was measured in 5 kiwifruit for each cultivar” corrected as“Firmness was measured in 5 kiwifruits, and repeated three times”

(4). Response to comment: Line 73, page 5: There is nothing about device for fruit hardiness measuring? If authors used penetrometer, what diameter for plunger was?

Response: Firmness was measured in 5 kiwifruits, and repeated three times. TA-XT2i Texture Analyzer (Stable Microsystems, Godalming,UK)was used to determin firmness and the diameter was 8mm.

(5). Response to comment: Line 75, page 5: There is no information in which acid authors expressed acidity. Please specify!

Response: We have made correction according to the Reviewer’s comments, because no relation between acidity and water soluble vitamins in this passage, delete this parts.

Statistical analysis

(1). Response to comment: Line 88, page 5: “All analyses were run in triplicate”. Authors should explain more clearly how many fruits were per replication and how

many replications were per studied cultivar for determination of firmness, total soluble solids, and titratable acidity. Did authors take into consideration that one fruit is one replication?

Response: We have made correction according to the Reviewer’s comments, all analyses were run in three duplicates and the duplicate used 5 kiwifruits of each cultivar.

(2). Response to comment: Line 90, page 5: Authors used ANOVA to assess differences in vitamin content for different storage times. They did not mention what test they used for mean separation. Please specify!

Response: Differences(Duncan) tests were considered statistically significant at *p*<0.05.

Determination of firmness, total soluble solids, and titratable acidity

(1). Response to comment: Page 5: Next parameters of fruit quality: fruit firmness, total soluble solids, and titratable acidity are not related to title of article“Changes in the content of water-soluble vitamins in Actinidia chinensis during cold storage”. It will be better to determine correlation among these studied parameters and water-soluble vitamins.

Response: We have made correction according to the Reviewer’s comments, when kiwifruit picked period follow 6.5≤TSS≤7.5, and the firmness≤1 N mm-1 there was no need to store. The first period followed 6.5≤TSS≤7.5, the second was stored 30 days, and the last period was when the firmness≤1 N mm-1. Delete”In the case of titratable acid, the pattern was less clear; in 4 cultivars, titratable acid decreased over time, while there was no change across the three sample periods for the Huayou cultivar. Interestingly, the Cuiyu cultivar’s titratable acid reach its peak at 30 days, while in Jingnong-2, titratable acid content increased across all three time points”.

(2). Response to comment: Line 94, page 5 „total soluble solid” has to change “ total soluble solids”, which is general expression in International Journal in Pomology

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing total soluble solid” changed “ total soluble solids”

(3). Response to comment: Line 94, page 5 “titratable acid” has to change "titratable acidity",which is general expression in International Journal in Pomology.

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing “titratable acid” has to change "titratable acidity",Delete "titratable acidity" parts,for titratable acidity had no relation with water soluble vitramins, no titratable acidity in this passage.

(4). Response to comment: Page 6: Table 1. is difficult to understand and authors should improveit. There is problem with small letters, which should represent significant differences among mean. In my opinion the best way is reducing number of digit of standard deviation.

Response: Considering the Reviewer’s suggestion, reducing number of digit of standard deviation.

Conclusion

(1). Response to comment: Line 197, page 11:. We are very sorry for our negligence of Authors concluded that „vitamin C decreased with storage”. This general opinion is contradictory with results which are shown in Figure 2 E, and in lines 160, 161 and 168. This part of the sentence should be adequately supported by the data from the Figure 2 E.

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of “vitamin C decreased with storage”corrected as” vitamin C in most cultivars increased with storage, while the contents of other vitamins had no similar change trends.”

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we list the changes and marked in red in revised paper.  
We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.  
Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Best regards.

Correspondent author: Ren Xiao-lin