AUTHOR'S REPLY TO THE REVIEW REPORT (**REVIEWER 3**)

The ideas and the results are clearly presented in the manuscript, So, it requires minor revision on the bases of following comments.

Figures and Tables:

1. Please improve quality of Figure 1, 2 and 3. These figures look blurred. Good graphics attract lot of the researchers to read the research work.

Figures has been improved according with the Journal requirements.

2. Please check bibliography. Few names of journals are abbreviated while others are not.

Thank you for the observation. We have checked the bibliography according to the Journal requirements.

3. Please remove grammatical mistakes.

Thank you very much. We have checked the grammatical mistakes

4. Cite some latest articles on this specific problem in introduction section. Latest articles mean, published in 2023.

Two references were added:

Cortés, L.A.; Moncayo, D.C.; Castellanos, D.A. Development of an antimicrobial packaging system for fresh cape gooseberry (Physalis peruviana L.) fruits. Food Pack. and Shelf Life, 2023, 38, 101113.

Chand, S.; Devi, S.; Devi, D.; Arya, P.; Manorma, K.; Kesta, K.; Sharma, M.; Bishist, R.; Tomar, M. Microbial and physi-co-chemical dynamics associated with chicken feather compost preparation vis-à-vis its impact on the growth performance of tomato crop. Biocat. and Agr. Biotech. 2023, 54, 102885.

5. Move Figure S6 from supplementary file to main manuscript.

We have move Figure S6 to the main manuscript

6. Compare NMR with related literature.

We have compared NMR data with cited literature

Others that updated by reviewer:

1. The most prime motive of the research should be more elaborated in introduction section with some latest references.

The aim of the present work has been addressed according to the needs in the field that we are working, correlated with the latest references.

2. References are appropriate but in some references, name of journal is abbreviated whereas in others, abbreviations are not used. For example, see reference numbers 8, 32, 38.

We have done the corrections.

3. The conclusion is fine, but it should be concise.

Thank you for your observations.

4. Please mention how the research reported in the manuscript is more fruitful with respect to the similar research reported in literature.

In the present work we are doing the correlation between the chemical part with the structure of the cutin and how could be distributed the components on it, in order to understand why these compounds in the cutin could make it susceptible to a faster maturation process.

5. Material and method section: please mention why not fruits without the calyx are placed in boiling water for 2 hours or more?

The fruits without the calyx were placed in boiling water for 30 min (Not for 2 hours or more) in order to eliminate the pulp and seeds.

6. Please add full name of abbreviations when used for the first time in the manuscript.

Thank you for your observations. Full name of abbreviations has been added for the first time.

7. Please mention the limitations of present research work in introduction section.

For this work, the limitation we have was not studying the ripening process of the Mexican husk tomato, but that's another topic for future research.