



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. Descriptions of statistical analyses is not complete. There is need to describe the analyses of descriptive and inferential statistical approaches used.</p> <p>2. Presentation of results for 1 above. And these to show which treatments differed statistically significantly using appropriate means.</p> <p>3. Using shorter names of treatments (T1, T2, etc...), rather than their descriptions in text.</p> <p>4. The authors used only one reference per statement throughout. Unless it is a journal policy, that is not a standard writing style for scientific articles.</p> <p>5. The problem statement and study justification needs to refer to similar literature to show what is already known vs what is new that the MS adds to knowledge</p> <p>6. The reviewer suggested the use of the term NOVEL instead of NEWER. The authors still cling the the word NEWER in the text, which is not appropriate.</p> <p>7. See the attachment</p>	<p>Treatments differed statistically significantly were depicted by small letters as superscript on the means (ex: 89.9<sup>a</sup> is statistically different from 85.43<sup>b</sup>)</p> <p>I felt there will be difficulty in understanding the results. So I didn't changed.</p> <p>Already shown</p> <p>Newer is changed to novel</p> <p>Seen</p>