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Dear Editors

We acknowledge that the comments that you have given to us were very constructive. We are convinced that the manuscript was not well polished in terms of English language. We sought the assistance of colleagues who are excellent in written English and tried to correct as per your advice, the comments you gave us.

Now we feel that all the necessary corrections are completed in as much as the deadline you wish to be resubmitted. We made the following corrections and changes on the manuscript:

1. **Abstract:**
   As you strongly advised us, we tried to come up a relatively good abstract. The objective section of the abstract was total removed. The last purpose statement of the background is totally modified by removing the objective section of the abstract. Subject - verb agreement and tense problems were also corrected. In each sections of the abstract we made substantial changes and improved it to be scientifically acceptable. We are still happy to hear from you regarding the modification we made regarding the abstract.

2. **Background:**
   Only language problems were corrected and as such there were no additional or removal of literatures in this section of the manuscript. Particular attention was given to correct subject - verb agreement and tense grammatical errors which could change the meanings and affect the flow of ideas in the background.

3. **Methodology:**
   Still there were no changes on the methods and procedures used in the whole research processes. We only made necessary changes on the grammatical errors. Accordingly, we made minor modifications without changing the previous methods and procedures used for the sake of making the writings clear for readers of the manuscript.

4. **Result:**
   In this section, we have improved the language mistakes and the interpretations of the findings.

5. **Discussion:** In this section also we have modified the written English problems observed without changing/or removing the literatures used to reflect on the findings of the study. Hence, only language modifications were made with meaningful interpretations and comparisons with other studies' findings.

6. **Conclusion and recommendations:**
   In this section also, there were no major changes made during revision. We only improved the language limitations otherwise the contents of the conclusions and recommendations made remain same as before.

To sum up, we found too many language mistakes while writing the manuscript and we feel that mistakes have been improved substantially or totally removed in the manuscript. Still we look forward to hearing from you for further improvement of the manuscript.

Respectfully,

Authors