

### **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 have 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.

### **Authors Feedback**

1. I have revised the introduction to include some literature.
2. There is no much comparison with other studies due to unavailability of literature.
3. There is a discussion section on line 164.
4. There issue of poor grammar has been addressed.

Please recommendation regarding literature is welcomed.