

Comment of Editor:

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 weak 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 difficult to follow. If the authors wish to publish their manuscript 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.

The authors should provide a revised manuscript with improved English and corrected tables.

Author's Feedback:

I corrected the manuscript and for the uppercase of fibre in the table 3, I write the uppercase obtained