



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	
Manuscript Number:	
Title of the Manuscript:	
Type of Article:	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Comments and reasons for Rejection 1. It appears that authors have not understood meaning of variation of data in the table 1. Data should be mentioned as, eg., 10.45 ± 0.5 means maximum value of parameter is 10.95 and minimum value is 9.95. Such representation is provided in Table 3 2. Xylanase and other activities should have been provided in the form of tables for better clarity 3. Again authors say that randomized design does not require codes and levels, (every factor will have a range, which means there is bound to be levels for that factor or any factor for that matter). DoE (Design of experiment) tables should be provided containing factors, levels (or range), responses (result or outcome).	1. The authors agree with the suggestion of the reviewer and carried it out in the work. Line 132 to 133. 2. The authors agree with the suggestion of the reviewer and carried it out in the work. Line 190 to 193. 3. The authors agree with the reviewer. However, we emphasize that our experiments had sweet sorghum varieties as treatments and all the variables responses are in the tables. All treatments were submitted to the same initial conditions without levels of fertilization or other management practices.