

Editor's Comment:

Considering the following two main comments of the reviewers which have not been addressed in the new version again, here are my main observations:

- 1) The structure of the introduction has still remained the same. There seems a lack of rich literature review in the introduction section. Just a couple of references has been added.
- 2) The results have not been discussed well, especially in comparison with other studies.
- 3) There is no discussion section in the new version and just two references have been added in one part of the result section.
- 4) Poor English of the paper, especially in the added parts of the new version. There are even several sentences with no dot at the end!

"Non-addressed comments of the reviewers":

Reviewer MS: The references are generally too scanty. More literature is required to improve the quality of the paper.

Reviewer RW: Discussions related to other findings were not addressed.

Seems to me that the author did not spend enough time on the paper. While the paper includes interesting results, it is not yet structured soundly as a scientific article. Accordingly, I find it fair to "reject" the paper.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Hossein Azadi
Department of Geography, Ghent University, Belgium