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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Prof. Raffy Mar Gella:

Thanks a lot for those comments on my paper (MS: 1510778420918727). I revised my paper as the editor advised and submitted the revised manuscript. Now, I would like to give a point-by-point response to the comments.

Answer to Editor’s comments:

Q1. In the Method section, the authors need to note why they chose to use \( p < .25 \) for inclusion of variables into their regression analyses and to cite Sun et al. (2007) as they referred to this study in their rebuttal letter.

Answer: Thanks a lot for this great comment. I have added the information according to your suggestion in the method section (page 12, line 9-11). If you think it was not enough, I will look forward to your further advice.

Q2. The first paragraph of the Discussion begins on page 13 and ends on page 16 - this length is just too long. Instead, this section needs to be broken down into several paragraphs that make logical and coherent sense.

Consultation from a native English speaker/writer is strongly recommended to accomplish this restructuring.

Answer: Thanks a lot for your important advice. I have used a professional language editing service from E danz as you recommended to me to edit the language through my whole manuscript by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise and restructured the first paragraph of the Discussion according to your suggestion. I am sorry again for my poor English writing and I really appreciate your guidance and help for me. If you think it was not enough, I will look forward to your further advice.
Q3. On page 16, line 13, "<1" should read "<1%".

Answer: Thanks a lot for this great comment. I have changed my expression in the discussion section (page16, line20). If you think it was not enough, I will look forward to your further advice.

These changes are made with considering editor’s comments. If the change is not sufficient, we are looking forward for further advices!

Thanks in advance!

Best wishes,

Sincerely

Jiana Wang, Lie Wang