



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11035
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of physicochemical parameters during storage of the inflorescence sap deriving from four Ivorian coconut (Cocos nucifera L.) varieties
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. The manuscript deals with the sap quality during storage 2. This is a very general work and a lot of information and advance studies are available from Philippines, Malaysia and India 3. The introduction should project the gap in knowledge and requirement for such a study 4. Methodology is not adequate to draw the conclusion that WAT produces most nutritious sap. Just by taking one time (even in three separate dates of same season?) does not provide such conclusion. 5. Sap was sampled twice in a day. What are the variations between harvests? 6. How they varied between dates of harvest? 7. If the motive was to study the changes occurring storage, then there were no other storage treatments. 8. Methodology description is not adequate 9. Results are too obvious 10. The correlation matrix has several auto-correlated parameters 11. No data on different dates and times of sap collection. 12. Discussion is more generic and superfluous.	1. OK 2. Of course, a lot of studies were achieved in Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia and India on the coconut sap. However, few of them compare saps derived from different coconut varieties. 3. In the condition of Côte d'Ivoire, this study is not yet done. 4. The conclusion has been revised. 5. This was not our objective. We compared the same kind of sap from the four coconut varieties. 6. Idem. 7. We indicated "natural fermentation" and we took the same temperature of storage for all the samples. 10. As seen in table 2, the correlation matrix highlights the relations between the 10 parameters assessed. 11. We indicated the dates and the duration of the study in the abstract section. 12. Discussion is now revised and performed.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The data presented in this manuscript is too less to be a full research paper. The manuscript also requires through check for English grammar In my opinion, this paper is not suitable for publication due to very less amount of samples drawn in temporal scale to draw any tangible conclusions	We checked the English grammar while revising the manuscript.