

Editorial Comments:

After checking the reviewer comments and the revised paper manuscript, I found that the paper needs further revision in order to enhance the readability and match the structure requirement of the journal. Specifically the manuscript should be divided into numbered sections (and subsections) with brief headings. The author should read the "General Guidelines for Authors" provided on the journal website (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors>), especially information regarding manuscript structure. Among other requirements, the guideline specifies the following

"The text, excluding the abstract, if required, can be divided into numbered sections with brief headings. Starting from introduction with section 1. subsections should be numbered (for example 2.1 (then 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, etc.), up to three levels"

"Research Papers and Short Notes should follow the structure of Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions, Consent (where applicable), Ethical approval (where applicable), and References plus figures and/or tables."

Author's Feedback:

I am delighted to say that the manuscript has been structured in line with the editorial's demand. I believe that if the manuscript is perused once again, it would attract the editorial good remarks as more information has been added to enhance understandability. Again, the manuscript has been well structured. The numbering has been appropriated in right places in the manuscript and the tables have been relocated to the last page (after the reference page). However, I have to say here that the figures were left in the manuscript because the succeeding contents are direct interpretation of the figures and as such, separating the figures may cause information gap making it difficult for the potential readers to understanding the message.

Greatly, I want to thank my reviewer for assisting in structuring the manuscript and helping to force out meaning from this paper.

Once again, I want to say that this paper should be regarded as empirical research and any careless lifting of the content is highly prohibited. Thanks in anticipation.