

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_120940
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Particle Size Distribution of Coco Pith: Implications of Soil Suitability Classes, Varietal Variation, Processing Method and Status of Ageing.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work is important for the scientific community, the author, through his scientific research, tries to study some important and well-selected factors, preferentially, the genetic nature of coconut varieties (TT and DT), soil suitability classes (S1-S4) and fiber extraction method (wet grinding and dry grinding) and lastly the aging state (aged and unaged), on the PD of PC. The results of this study have given very specific and technical recommendations that are important and profitable from the economic point of view.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, I think that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, this research work is varied, rich in experimental results, found by precise and varied experimental methods and chemical analyses and also using statistical analyses, all of which reinforce the reliability of the results found.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are largely sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is appropriate for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The environmental factors cited by the author are not well defined in the manuscript	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nedjah Nawel
Department, University & Country	National Higher School of Technology and Engineering, Algeria