



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. In some parts language needs editing while in material and method section the methods need to be clearly presented,</p> <p>2. As in the case f sugar determination, where the flow rate of the pump is written to be 0.5-1.0 ml/min. Which was it?</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p>4. 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).</p> <p>5. Furthermore, the statistical analysis is done in time (as indicated by the footnote of the tables) so the "...treatments...." in the footnote is wrong.</p> <p>6. 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.</p>	<p>Noted and effected in the manuscript. The methodology/procedure of each parameter has been presented separately.</p> <p>The flow rate of the pump we used was 1 ml/min. This has been noted and corrected in the manuscript</p> <p>The HPLC used was fitted with phenomenex 250mm*4.6mm*5µl Amino NH2P column. This has been included in the corrected manuscript</p> <p>The sugar units are mg/100g. This has been corrected. We have realised an error on the formula used for tabulation of sucrose value hence the reason for such quite high values. This has been duly corrected in the manuscript and data reanalysed.</p> <p>This has been changed to capture the effect of treatment, zone and time</p> <p>Noted and duly changed in the revised manuscript version 2</p>