



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22464
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICAL AND DIETARY PROPERTIES OF IN-SHELL PINE NUTS (PINUS PINEA L.) AND KERNELS
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Table 4: Carbohydrates should be the last column of the table since it was determined by subtraction. It should also be made clear that the carbohydrate content was determined by subtraction. Latin names should be italicized (in references section as well).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The storage conditions of the in-shell pine nuts are of utmost importance to this work. It seems, therefore, that a more detailed explanation of the conditions in which the nuts were stored (cold-room/controlled temperature, sealed bag, exposed to sunlight, exposed to ambient air, etc...) since harvest in 2004, 2005, and 2007 would be appropriate. How long after harvest were the physical and chemical analyses undertaken, and how were the pine nuts stored after sub-sampling prior to analysis? Since climatic conditions are central to the study, a more in-depth discussion of the climatic conditions (average rainfall, min/max/average temperature, etc.) for the growing seasons studied would be beneficial. Without this discussion, the insignificant change in chemical composition of the pine nuts is not as meaningful a finding since it may be that climatic conditions during pine nut production for the three years did not vary to a large extent.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<u>Specific text suggestions (other grammatical issues exist and should be checked):</u> Line 16: “Pinus Pinea L.” does not need to be repeated. Numbers less than twenty should be written out, for example in lines 12, 42, and 93. Lines 52-53. There appear to be some words italicized that should not be italicized. Lines 70 and 76: Replacing the word “researches” with the word “studies” would be better. Something seems to be wrong with the formatting of all tables. The tops of the superscripts are cut off. Line 190: “... as well as some other possible factors.” This should be expanded upon or removed. References: 1: This reference links to a website that cannot be found. 24: “University of Newada” should be “University of Nevada.” 34: Journal abbreviation is missing periods.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Derek B. Corbett
Department, University & Country	Department of Paper and Bioprocess Engineering, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, USA