



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. (1) Authors have not cherished this revision opportunity, and they have not carefully revised their manuscript.</p> <p>2. For the point 1 of Feedback_AIR_100958_v1_Moh.docx, although authors have revision the abstract, the abstract quality also be just so so. The research background part accounts for most abstract space. Generally speaking, it is not allowed to offer an example in abstract.</p> <p>3. For the point 2 of Feedback_AIR_100958_v1_Moh.docx, authors have not conducted a new literature survey.</p> <p>4. Especially, for the point 5 of Feedback_AIR_100958_v1_Moh.docx, authors have not made the comparisons. Authors stated that the paper was long enough.</p> <p>5. Especially, for the point 6 of Feedback_AIR_100958_v1_Moh.docx, the conclusion quality also be just so so.</p> <p>6. (2) Although the topic of this manuscript is far from my research interest of image encryption, the writing quality of this manuscript is weak in my opinion. More equations, figures and tables are expected.</p>	<p>1-Hope now it is done.</p> <p>2-abstract was reworked.</p> <p>3-The literature survey was enhanced.</p> <p>4-Comparison has been proposed at beginning of section 4 as a categorization of the illustrative cases.</p> <p>5- The conclusion was enhanced.</p> <p>6-How a legal analysis may give rise to equations?</p>