

Editor's Comment:

I have read all three reviewers' remarks along with the manuscript and I think the manuscript is well written but merits further corrections. In some parts language needs editing while in material and method section the methods need to be clearly presented, as in the case of sugar determination, where the flow rate of the pump is written to be 0.5-1.0 ml/min. Which was it? RID is not suited for either gradient or flow rate changes. Furthermore, the sugar concentration as it is presented in the tables 1 and 2 is somehow problematic. How is it possible for the sucrose concentration to be 197 g/100 g? I mean, one sugar (sucrose) is present in a mass higher than the mass of the fruit extracted (197 g in 100 g is quite impossible, unless it is equivalent, which in this case is not, since the authors measured it by HPLC). Furthermore, the statistical analysis is done in time (as indicated by the footnote of the tables) so the "...treatments..." in the footnote is wrong. Moreover, the letters are also posing a problem, since in the same column there is an incorrect placement of letters (there is a, b and then goes to d and e, where is c?). If the authors made the analysis taking into account two factors, i.e. hex anal concentration and time, then this is a factorial experiment or the footnote should be more explanatory.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Peter A. Roussos
Agricultural University of Athens, Lab. Pomology, Greece