



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_32557
Title of the Manuscript:	Mineral nutrients in inflorescence sap produced from various coconuts (Cocos nucifera L.) cultivated in Côte d'Ivoire
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	Authors studied the macro and micro mineral content of the inflorescence sap of two coconut varieties and hybrids each. It is indeed very important to know the nutrient contents of the sap because sap collection and processing and marketing has found to be 6 to 8 fold more profitable than allowing the tree for the nuts. However, article needs thorough revision. In the material and methods mention the ambient climatic condition under which the sap was collected so that readers can understand the sap quality. In the results you need not highlight the equipment standardisation. It is universal. Discussion is too general Make it more concise. One or two references are quoted in comparison to that discuss the results.	Thanks so much for the comments. The document has been improved accordingly to the reviewer's suggestions, to fit good quality manuscript. Nevertheless , the results regarding the device used for analysis need to be revealed since the soundness of our results depends on the efficiency of the equipment. As the highlighting of these results does not trouble the main outcomes, we are favourable for their upholding.
Minor REVISION comments	Author must write properly and made crisp and lucid.	OK. We pass throughout the full manuscript and many improvements have been made to fit good quality manuscript.
Optional/General comments		