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**Reviewer's report:**

Discretionary revisions:

Title and abstract

Most readers only read the title and the abstract of a paper – particularly whilst browsing the internet and databases. These should therefore be concise and self-contained, providing a clear. The original title of the paper was written in good English. But, the title is not so specific and suitable for the manuscript.

Background

The main function of the background is to clearly and concisely establish the main question that the paper is trying to answer, how it relates to previous research in the field, and why it is important – the ‘hook’ and why the reader should care, the background of the research should be more comprehensive in this manuscript.

Methodology

The methodology should be presented in a coherent and self-contained way such that a competent person could repeat the study and reproduce the results by following the instructions given in the text. However, methodological details should be provided properly. These should be provided in full detail before submission to any journal. Study location and study period is not properly mentioned in the manuscript.

Results and Figures

The purpose of the results section is to present, in a logical order, research data that address the central argument presented in the title, Abstract and background. The results are described clearly and concisely, with important trends identified objectively and made clear to the reader, with a description of the relevant statistical analysis where applicable. The figures and tables are to be clear and complete, ideally with self-contained captions so that readers could understand their main message without needing to read the paper in full. However, more data are needed for future planning. The data should be inserted into the main text for the reader to understand clearly.

Discussion

The discussion should lead to a set of clear and scientifically sound set of
conclusions based on the existing data. Importantly, the discussion needs to be connected to the main hypothesis/question posed in the background and it should provide transparent arguments with regard to how it answers it. Where appropriate, it should discuss what additional research is needed to resolve any existing contradictions or exceptions.

The existing text includes discussion of the results well, so the relevance of the results to the main argument is clear. However, it should be broad discussion of the results so that reader can follow the main argument.

Major compulsory revisions:
There is no any major compulsory revisions.

Minor essential revisions:
Spelling and grammar should be corrected in some places.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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