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### FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)

The authors have made hardly any relevant improvements to the manuscript. The revised manuscript remains as rudimentary as before.

The argument that they have used GA to optimise the amount of biogas produced lacks substance. Production of biogas is controlled by the operating parameters such as pH, temperature, solid to liquid ratio etc. As I have stated in my first review, optimum values of these parameters reported by the authors are the well-known and well-established ones (since biogas production from cow dung is a well-established process). Since no alternate substrates have been tried, the manuscript reports nothing new.

The argument by the authors that they have considered fully refined biogas (which has passed through several treatments for the removal of all unwanted constituents except CO₂ and methane), by itself, speaks of the rudimentary nature of the economic analysis. The fuel thus considered in the CHP unit is an idealised one and the economy reported is based on the ideal fuel. As such, it is of no practical value. Economic considerations must include all the essential pre-treatments required for the biogas, since the cost–economy of biogas utilisation very much depend on these, as well.

A research paper, apart from repeating well-known data, must come forward with novel ideas and novel findings (considering all the real-life parameters) and should abstain from Utopian predictions. As I have recommended in the first review, the authors must make studies on alternate mixed substrates and must analysis the cost–effectiveness of biogas pre-treatment (including enrichment) processes, by studying these processes in all technical details.

### Authors' response to final evaluator's comments

Thanks for your invaluable comments. I worked hardly on this paper. It took almost 12 months that I was able to collect data on cow farm. I think that this paper has a valuable data that can be used with other researcher to improve their work and also economic assessment that have been done in this paper can be used by farmers to develop their farm. In this research we only consider main factors that have the greatest effect on the technical and economic evaluation. Our technical team is working to developed its study in the future and consider more parameters to make an accurate assessment. But at this stage we think that if we want to change the data, all of the relations and functions will change and in a short time we cannot obtain the appropriate results. We can use your valuable comments in future articles. We would thank you if you accept our paper.

Thank you very much for your review of our manuscript. Your suggestions were excellent. We will be sending more manuscripts to your journal in the future.

And finally

Submission of a manuscript to a journal is an exciting experience for researchers. News of acceptance from the Editor is even more exciting. News of rejection is usually very depressing but everyone's papers rejected once.