

Editor's Comment:

I have reviewed the revised manuscript and still find it unacceptable for publication. The primary reason is that while the authors corrected the discussion paragraph I used as an example they did not correct the rest of the paper. I used the discussion paragraph as a specific example of the poor English construction and the use of the reference number rather than authors name for the cited literature. It was not meant to be the only paragraph that needed to be corrected. The entire paper is poorly written and difficult to follow. While I understand English is not the authors first language, if they wish to publish in an English-language journal they need to work with someone that can assist them. The paper does not need a full re-write but it does need some significant editing for clarity and ease of reading.

Additionally, there are still errors in the Tables. In Table 2, the superscript for the TSR content for the BB leaves is not properly formatted while in Table 3, the TGT and VEN content for the AD leaves and the Fibre content for the CO leaves are missing superscript letters.

Finally, in Table 3 the Fibre content for the BB-calyx and BB-flower are $35.9+0.20$ and $35.76+0.19$ yet they have different uppercase letters. Based on the footnote under the table, this suggests that those values are statistically different. Although I don't have access to the raw statistical output, I strongly doubt these are statistically different from each other. The authors need to re-verify this result.

Should the authors provide a revised manuscript with improved English and corrected tables, I would be willing to reconsider; however, I will reject any further submission if the language is not cleaned up.

Editor's Details:

Dr. David E. Martin

Founder and Director, Evolv BioVet, Inc, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA