

**Editor's Comment:**

I evaluated this paper, but there are some big mistakes. For example, references are understandable. In the text, the reference numbers are mixed. Some of the references are missing. For example, where is the reference 20? Also, the number of references are not enough. Discussion is not enough. In the text, "These findings are in consonance with those results reported by 16, 13, 15, 7, 9 and 17." What is this???

So, this paper needs revisions.

**Editor's Details:**

Dr. Hakan Sevik  
Kastamonu University, Turkey.