

Editor's Comment:

After reviewing the last revision (v.5), I found that there are some aspects that need clarification/revision:

1. add "a" in the title after "... of" or before "non—Sacch..."
2. Page 8, Y-4 was identified as *P. kudriavzevii* SK1, however, there seem to be no comparison with the type strain of *P. kudriavzevii*, which should be discussed and compared interns of optimal growth conditions and capability of ethanol production from different sugars.
3. Define the "efficiency" in Table 1, which is not clear and actually very confusing if you look at both Fig 1 and 2 where the ethanol produced looks much smaller than the substrate consumed.
4. Page 9, the statement "However, ethanol production rate decreased at 250 and 300 g l⁻¹ glucose concentrations during fermentation, though ethanol concentration was found to be higher from higher glucose concentrations at the end of fermentation period." doesn't match the result presented in Table 2 in the first column where the higher concentration of substrate resulted in both higher rate and concentration. An explanation has to be provided.

100	49.24 (48)
150	69.73 (48)
200	90.62 (54)
250	104.83 (54)
300	118.24 (54)

5. Table 2, there seem to be a huge inconsistency of the results obtained using the same testing conditions (200 g l⁻¹, pH 5 and 35 °) for both *P. kudriavzevii* SK1 and *S.cervisiae* MTCC 11815. There is no statistic SD provided, which seem to be not reproducibile results.

200	90.62 (54)	88.83 (54)
5.0	79.4 (54)	65.4 (48)
35	65.47 (48)	53.34 (60)

Based on the points #4 and #5 above, the data provided do not look reliable.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Kesen Ma
Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Canada