

Editor's Comment:

The subject of the manuscript is of both scientific and practical interest.

Yet, although part of the suggestions of Reviewers have been correctly accounted for in the revised version of the manuscript, there remains a worrying difficulty.

This problem is with regard to highlighting and clearly characterizing the statistical significance of the comparisons between the various treatments implemented, a point already underlined clearly by the Reviewers.

In particular, I cannot see (unless the Authors clearly show me otherwise), what level of significance threshold (i.e. which "p value") was chosen by the authors – and this is, of course, of decisive importance here. These gaps in details regarding the statistical method used and the significance level adopted are detrimental to the proper assessment of the quality of the experimental work.

Now, on the other hand, the experimental work carried out is – on all other aspects - interesting and it would be a shame if it were not published.

Therefore, I recommend:

* either that the Authors complete, in a new revised version, the above improvements relating to the statistical aspect, whereby the improved manuscript may be published as "Original Research article" in IJECC;

* or, if not, (ie if the Authors fail or not desire to respond to this request), that the manuscript be accepted and published (thus without reference to the statistical significance aspect) but as "Research Notes" in IJECC.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Jean Beguinot
University of Burgundy, France.