



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44248
Title of the Manuscript:	POSTHARVEST PHYSIOLOGY AND QUALITY OF PALM SPROUTS HARVESTED AT DIFFERENT TIMES
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>)

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. Abstract portion is very poor, required full revision. 2. Delete 'Quantification' from key word and add more two key words 3. Introduction portion is well written but required some modification at 'Line 38-45' 4. A. In Methodology portion please mention the longitude and latitude of the experimental side to authenticate the climatic situation of the experimental area. B. Methodology of phenol estimation may be discussed fully with your modification because it may be followed by others as a standard particularly for palm sprout. 5. In Result and Discussion all the data should be carefully checked. I think in most of the cases coma (,) should be replaced with point (.) and these are yellow highlighted. 6. Result and discussion is well written but need more discussion with more supportive reference. 7. Conclusion portion is again very poor and not depicts any clear recommendation. Should be more precise with appropriate result.	The suggestions were accepted. We are very grateful for your suggestions. - the abstract has been rewritten; - acidity, ascorbic acid, cactus, <i>Opuntia ficus-indica</i>. - lines 38-45 were rewritten. - the changes requested in the methodology were incorporated into the methodology. (Latitude: 06° 46' 13" S and Longitude: 37° 48' 06" W, Phenolic compounds were estimated from the method of Folin and Ciocalteu with modifications [10]. An aliquot of 500 µL of the extract was transferred to a test tube and mixed with 1625 µL of water and 125 µL of the Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. The mixture was allowed to stand for 5 minutes, and then we added 250 µl of 20% sodium carbonate, followed by stirring and standing in a water bath at 40 °C for 30 minutes. The results were shown as mg of gallic acid 100 g⁻¹ FM). - The replacement of the comma (,) by the point (.), was accepted, and corrected in the manuscript. - References were added in the results and discussion. - The conclusion was rewritten
Minor REVISION comments	Go through top to bottom again minutely to avoid silly mistakes like grammatical error and data base error.	The manuscript was revised again carefully to avoid grammatical errors
Optional/General comments	Work is unique with its importance on own field but execution is very poor. Effect of harvest time interval not clearly execute in the manuscript. So configure the whole manuscript again with mentioned correction.	The manuscript was reconfigured according to the requested correction. The authors are grateful for their valuable contribution to the improvement of this work.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	