

Editor's Comment:

With respect, the article was reviewed. In general, according to the opinions of respected reviewers, the article still has several it is a serious problem... because at first our goal is to increase the quality of articles and ultimately the quality of the magazine. Therefore, to complete the article, the following items should be on the agenda:

1. The introduction section is very weak, it should be reviewed and more and newer sources should be used.
 2. The materials and methods are usually taken from a reliable references. The references from which this work method was taken should be cited.
 3. In the discussion section, the content is stated in a general, abstract, and isolated manner, which should be completely rewritten and compared with more up-to-date references so that the results take the form of an authentic scientific article.
 4. The overall result is very weak and needs to be strengthened.
 5. Article to 3 sources??? It is very weak and should be used from new and much more sources.
- Therefore, with respect to the opinions of the respected referees, in my opinion, the article is not suitable for publication in this fledgling journal, because our goal is to raise the quality level of the journal.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Abolfazl Azadi
Assistant Professor, Khuzestan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center,
AREEO, Ahvaz, Iran.