



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The aim of the study has not been incorporated in the abstract.</li><li>2. Replication used in the study is not shown as asked in the review; meaning that the results have no standard error or standard deviation, doubting their authenticity.</li><li>3. It's important to include statistical analysis to give comparative analysis of results.</li><li>4. Discussion of results as suggested by the reviewer would improve the manuscript.</li></ol>	<p>The aim is not incorporated in the abstract.</p> <p>The results in the tables have standard deviation and replication was taken into consideration.</p> <p>Descriptive statistical analysis was used in this study.</p> <p>The suggestion of the reviewer is apt. There is room for improvement in any given situation</p>