



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_23608
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of NPK Treatments on Sweet Sorghum Yields for Biofuel Feedstock in Piedmont Region of North Carolina
Type of Article:	Original Research Articles

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. Remove the vertical and horizontal grid lines in Tables 2-7 and, present as indicated in the example below. 2. What corrections have you made with regards to the comments for inconsistency in your references? 3. In your conclusion, you used the word "may be recommended" instead of "should be recommended" or "is recommended". In this case, you're implying that you're not quite convinced of the results of this study. 4. The recommendation is based on what parameter and for what variety? 5. What can you say about the variety? Do they perform the same?	1. Formatted tables as per the suggestion 2. We have straightened the references, there was one reference that was mentioned inconsistently 3. Changed the statement that the "can be recommended" 4. Recommendation is based on fresh stalk, sugar and juice yield for both varieties 5. No statistical difference was observed between the yields of the two varieties tested. It was mentioned in the discussion. Thank you for your review and suggestions.

Fertilizer treatment (kg ha ⁻¹)	Stalk fresh weight (ton/ha)		
	Dale	M-81-E	Mean
Control	21.5	32.1	26.8 ^b
168-56-168	50.8	52.1	51.5 ^a
84-28-84-soysoap	50.3	64.5	57.4 ^a
168-56-168-soysoap	36.0	50.0	43.0 ^a
Mean	39.6	49.7	