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Reviewer # 1: Dr. Deborah J Cohen

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question the authors address is well defined.
No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are appropriate, but require further description. See comments below.
As suggested by the reviewer, description on the methods was furnished in the revised manuscript under Methods.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes. The data appear to be sound.
No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.
No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, but this manuscript needs to be tightened and the Discussion is overly repetitive.
As suggested, some of the sections of manuscript are tightened by deleting the repetitions.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No. I didn’t see any discussion of the study’s limitations.
Limitations of the study are spelt clearly under methodology section of the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 6 - page number: 7, paragraph: 1).

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building both published and unpublished?
I am not an expert in this topic and would defer on this assessment. That said the literature reviewed seems adequate.
No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything. However, a thorough literature search is made during the study as well as during drafting of the manuscript. The manuscript is built upon Kleinman’s explanatory model. This is clearly mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph:1).

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes. However, the title could be shortened.
Abstract was shortened. However, I felt it difficult to shorten the title further.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, although I believe the paper needs to be condensed significantly and the figure is so complicated as to not be particularly useful.
The paper is condensed significantly.
As reviewer commented that the figure is complicated, the figure was simplified by giving two simple figures in the revised manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions

Minor Essential Revisions

Tighten up the language and make sure the manuscript is as concise as possible.
As suggested, the revised manuscript is made concise as far as possible.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Overall Comments:

This is an interesting manuscript that is longer than it need be. There is a great deal of redundancy between the Results and Discussion. The Results can also be tightened up (see my comments below).
As commented by the reviewer, the redundancy between results and discussion has been found and they were deleted, and Results and Discussion sections were tightened.

Introduction

This review seems adequate. I would tighten the language as much as possible.
The language is tightened up, as the reviewer indicates.

Methods
More description is needed in this section.

1. Sample – Although this may have been a language barrier, it was not entirely clear what made people eligible for participating in this study. What does it mean to be good observers and willing to share information? In addition, more information about participants is needed. For example, educational background, profession, socioeconomic status) may be useful to report as this could influence perceptions, attitudes and beliefs regarding hypertension.
As suggested, the methods section was improved by giving further description. The selection of participants for interviews and discussions were given. The meaning of ‘good observers’, ‘willing to share information’, etc. were provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 3 - page number: 5, paragraph: 1&2).
Also, the socio-economic background of the study participants was provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 1).
2. With regard to sampling – you have an N of 14 for interviews and an N of 3 for the focus groups. While this sample size may be sufficient, this is currently difficult to judge. In qualitative research, the focus is not on the size of the sample, but whether or not thematic saturation was reached; the point at which themes repeat and no new information is being ascertained about the research question. The authors do not discuss this in the manuscript. Further, it is unclear if the study was designed to assess saturation. To assess saturation, the research design needs to be iterative. That is, the research team moves between data collection, analysis and sample selection in order to allow early insights shape the interview guide and influence the selection of subsequent participants. The process of data collection, analysis and sample selection continues until there is repetition found in what people are saying. There is no evidence in the current manuscript that there was in iterative process or that saturation was reached.

With regard to determining the number of interviews and focus group discussions, a description is given in revised manuscript. At the end of the day, the researchers discussed the highlights of each interview and important aspects of the narrations were noted down. These notes were thoroughly examined for new information and repetitions. Selection of key informants continued till the redundancy of data has occurred. However, only three focus groups were conducted due to limited resources. These details were given in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 1; page number: 5, paragraph: 2).

3. The author should include a brief statement about preconceptions and how this may have influenced this study and its findings.

As suggested, preconceptions of the researcher were mentioned in the revised manuscript under methods, as follows:

The preconceptions of the researchers, based on previous studies, such as proneness of urban people specifically with obesity, and stressful life; lack of awareness regarding hypertension, might have influenced the development of topic guides to some extent page number: 6, paragraph: 5).

4. The author should include the interview guide in the manuscript or as a supplement to the manuscript.

The contents of guides of interview and focus group discussion (question lines) were provided in the revised manuscript under methods section (page number: 6, paragraph: 3 - page number: 6, paragraph: 4).

5. The Methods section should also include a rationale for why both interview and focus group data collection methods were used.

The reviewer suggested to include a rationale for using both in-depth interviews and focus groups and it was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 2).

6. Focus groups and interviews are different and require separate description in the Methods section. For example, with focus groups it is necessary to understand the rationale for selecting participants and organizing the groups. For example: were these heterogeneous or homogenous group, were they moderated, were they moderated by someone who is trained in conducting focus groups, were they audio-recorded, were notes taken to capture group dynamics, etc.
As suggested by the reviewer, separate descriptions for in-depth interviews with key informants and focus group discussions with community members were given in the revised manuscript. Details of the participants, selection and other details such as how these groups were moderated and conducted were given in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 1 & 2).

7. In addition, focus group and interview data cannot be analyzed in the same manner. In focus groups, one person’s answer may influence what others in the group say. This manuscript needs more description of the approach used for analyzing these data in general (including all the steps you followed and why), and would benefit from some citations to give the readers a sense of the works that inform the approach used. In addition, more information is needed about how the data were analyzed and what different steps were used to analyze interview and focus group data.

As suggested, analyses were carried out separately for in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. However, the inferences drawn from both types of data were utilized while presenting the results. It was mentioned under Data Management and Analysis in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 4 & 5 - page number: 8, paragraph: 1 & 2).

8. Results – I think this section would be greatly improved if the findings were better synthesized around 1 to 3 important findings. In its current form, it appears that what informants said was organized topically and reported with little in depth analysis and interpretation. For example, one finding of this study may be that there are few differences between the two groups the researcher approached. This is an important finding. A second finding may be that there were a number of misconceptions about hypertension and its causes and cures among those studied. Within such a sub-heading (if this sub-heading is appropriate) one might report the patterns in misunderstanding, using 1 or maybe 2 quotes that support each claim.

As suggested by the reviewer, the results are re-synthesized by identifying four major findings and the results section was reorganized under four headings.

9. Currently there are too many quotes in the text.
The reviewer commented that there were too many quotes in the text. Some of the quotes were removed and only few appropriate quotes were retained in the revised manuscript.

10. Group process often strengthens the data collection and analysis process, fostering reflection and different ways of seeing and understanding the data. Given this is a single author publication it would be useful to know if there was a group process (these people should be recognized) or how the author addressed this important limitation.

The reviewer commented group process often strengthens the data collection and analysis process. I acknowledge that this may be a limitation of the study. However, group process has been taken up to the extent possible. The narrations of interviews and focus groups were discussed with staff involved. The project staff was available to the author only during data collection. However, care was taken regarding the inferences drawn from the data by checking with another anthropologist, who was not involved in this study. All these details were
mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 6 - page number: 7, paragraph: 1; page number: 8, paragraph: 2).

11. Currently, the Discussion repeats what has been reported in the Results. It is reasonable to offer a brief summary of results in the Discussion section. However, the primary focus should be on discussing the conclusion and implications of the work. Developing the Discussion section in this direction would strengthen the manuscript. As suggested, the discussion section was revised thoroughly by avoiding the repetition of results. Conclusions along with their implications on prevention and control were presented at the end of the discussion.

12. A discussion of the study’s limitations should be added to the Discussion section. As suggested, the study limitations were mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 6 - page number: 7, paragraph: 1). However, these were mentioned under methodology section as the limitations in qualitative studies mainly pertain to methodological issues.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
As suggested, the manuscript is thoroughly checked for language correction.

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Reviewer #2: Dr Denise C Fyffe

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   a. The authors present an important topic that is very timely.
   No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

   b. Background: 2nd sentence is confusing – the direction of the social gradient is implied and should be stated clearly. The authors may want to include a sentence that compares the prevalence and risk factors of hypertension among low and high SES people living in India, if that information is available.
   As suggested by the reviewer, a sentence in the backgrounds is made clear by rephrasing it. The following information, along with relevant references is provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph: 1).

       ...... Some studies indicated that the prevalence of hypertension was high in higher socio-economic groups compared to the lower socio-economic groups. However, recent studies indicated that low socio-economic communities are not exempted from the risk of hypertension. The socio-economically disadvantaged communities like migrants in large cities are vulnerable to hypertension. ..... 

   c. Background: A brief description of the socio-economic (and maybe cultural characteristics) of the 2 migrant groups may be helpful to the reading audience. What is the prevalence of hypertension among migrants groups?
   As suggested, a brief description on background of two study migrant groups was presented. Also, the prevalence of hypertension among these groups was mentioned along with the reference (page number: 3, paragraph: 2 - page number: 4, paragraph: 1).

   d. Background: Although the authors mention the socioeconomic determinants of hypertension in India, the introduction seems to missing a sentence or two that highlight other important epidemiological findings about the prevalence and risk factors (e.g., genetic factors) associated with hypertension in India.
   Also, some epidemiological findings on risk factors for increasing prevalence of hypertension in Indian populations were included in the revised manuscript. They were supported by appropriate references (page number: 3, paragraph: 1).

   e. Background: What is it about migrant groups that put them at a disadvantage and risk of hypertension – is it only lower SES?
   A brief account on the vulnerability and risk of poor health of the study groups was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 1).

   f. Background: Sentence 7 “Explanatory models...”: Need a reference for this sentence. It isn’t clear if the authors are proposing to use Kleinman’s explanatory models to describe/compare the perceptions of settled and neo-settled migrants about hypertension.
The Kleinman’s concept of explanatory models (EMs) was used in the present study. A brief description on EMs, along with references was presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph: 1).

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   a. The authors failed to mention whether the study was approved by the IRB.
   The present study was approved by ethics committee of the author’s institute. It was mentioned in the revised manuscript, as suggested (page number: 7, paragraph: 2).
   
   b. Was the topic guide developed based on: i) previous studies with other ethnic/racial groups; ii) theoretical model (e.g., health belief model); iii) previous pilot data?
   The topic guide is developed following the Kleinman’s explanatory model. It was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 6 , paragraph: 3&4).
   
   c. Pretesting the topic guide – please tell the reading audience more about that (e.g., who did the authors recruit to pre-pilot the material? what was the feedback from the pre-pilot testing?)
   As suggested by the reviewer, a description on pretesting of the topic guides was provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 6 , paragraph: 2).
   
   d. Using key informants and focus groups was relevant to the topic area and research questions. However, the authors did not justify the use of key informants in conjunction with focus groups (e.g., was it to provide validation of the results – themes generated – from the focus groups?).
   A justification on using both in-depth interviews and focus groups was given in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 2).
   
   e. Key informant approach requires careful selection criteria of formal or informal leaders, influential leaders or experts. Table 1 indicates that the key informants were from both migrant groups – this also needs to be mentioned in the text.
   As suggested, the details of key informants were given in the revised manuscript. An explanation with reference to table 1 is provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 1).
   
   f. Recruitment of focus group participants is not clearly outlined. Was it a purposive sample?
   The selection of participants by purposive sampling was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 2).
   
   g. Were there any incentives provided for the study participants? If so, please mention these incentives.
   No incentives were provided for the study participants. This was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 2).

3. Are the data sound?
   a. Were the qualitative analyses based on a theory (e.g., grounded theory)? If so, please describe.
The present study is based on Kleinman’s explanatory model and a brief description was given in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph: 1).

b. The researchers did not discuss saturation of the data. Was saturation met during data collection?
Saturation of the data was assessed to stop further interviews with key-informants. It was assessed by reading the interview narrations and discussion among the researchers. These details were mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 1).

c. The interviews and focus groups were transcribed into English – was the translation of the interviews and focus groups verified?
Interviews and discussions were conducted in Hindi, the local language; transcribed into Hindi and then translated into English. Some scripts were translated by two individuals and back translated to check reliability and correctness. These details were given in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 3).

d. It is not clear if the interviews/focus groups were conducted in English or Hindi or both languages – translation (and back translation) are important aspects of qualitative methodology – What are some of the implications of using translation?
Interviews and discussions were conducted in Hindi, the local language; transcribed into Hindi and then translated into English. These details were given in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 3).

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

a. Table 1 is not described in the “Results” section. Table 1 includes too much information. Please report descriptive information about key informants and focus group participants in separate tables (include mean age and age range).
The reviewer opined that Table 1 includes too much information and suggested to make separate tables for interviews and discussions. Accordingly, changes were made and these two tables were referred in the text. The details of age of the participants were also given page number: 5, paragraph: 1 - page number: 5, paragraph: 2; page number: 21, Table: 1 & 2).

b. The presentation of the narrative data is a little confusing. The first sentence of this section should be used to let the readers know the structure of the presentation of these qualitative findings and illustrative quotes.
As suggested by the reviewer, a sentence on how results are presented was given at the beginning of the results section (page number: 8, paragraph: 3).

c. The first 2 sentences in the results section illustrate are confusing. Was the English phrase “blood pressure” used throughout all of the interviews and focus group discussions? Or only when participants used that term was it also used by interviewers or focus groups moderators? Hypertension is called as ‘BP’ in this community. Researchers also used ‘BP’ to refer to hypertension during interviews and discussions. These details are presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 8, paragraph: 4).
d. The authors should not refer to the study participants as “people” (in the 3rd person) but use another term (e.g., participants, interviewees).

As suggested, it was avoided to refer to the study participants as ‘people’.

e. Pg 6: Need a heading to introduce “The present explanatory models of people…”

Separate heading was given for a section on causes of hypertension, as suggested by the reviewer (page number: 9, paragraph: 2).

f. Participant identifiers with the quotes are helpful be sure to use a consistent format.
A consistent format is followed while presenting the quotes in the text.

5. Are the discussion and conclusion well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

a. The discussion and conclusion are fairly well done.
No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

b. Figure 1 needs to be explained.
Based on the comment of another reviewer, the figure was made simple and presented as two figures. They were briefly explained in the text (page number: 9, paragraph: 2; page number: 10, paragraph: 2).

6. Are the limitations of the work clearly stated?

a. Limitations were not mentioned (e.g., potential bias in recruitment, data collection, development of topic guide)

The limitations of the study were presented in the revised manuscript under methods section (page number: 6, paragraph: 6 - page number: 7, paragraph: 1).

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

a. The authors acknowledge that there has been quite of literature about the prevalence and risk factors associated with hypertension among the people of India. What is important about this study is that it is one of the first studies to examine the perspectives of this high risk of group to help inform community interventions.

No specific revision is made as reviewer has not suggested anything.

8. Does the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Title is fine. The abstract should be strengthened based on the revisions outlined.

The abstract was been rewritten after revision of the main manuscript.

9. Is the writing acceptable?

a. Needs to be reviewed for tense and wording (e.g., page 9: “cardiovascular” is 1 word; page 10 last paragraph “round” should be “around” and “peoples” should be ‘participants’);

As suggested, usage of some of the phrases and words was corrected.
b. Lower case the term “in-depth”
   Done

Major Compulsory Revisions

Background
• Refer to comments in point 1 above
   Done

• The authors need to strengthen their line of argument for carrying out the study
• Improve the section that outlines the authors reasons for focusing on and/or comparing migrant groups in this section
   As suggested, the argument for carrying out this research was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph: 1). Also, the reason for focusing two groups of migrants is mentioned (page number: 4, paragraph: 1).

Methods
• See comments above in point 2 & 3
   Done and explanation is given above.

• Provide more information about pre-testing methods (e.g., topic guide)
   As suggested by the reviewer, a description on pretesting of the topic guides was provided in the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 2).

• Please be more specific about the way translation (and back translation) was conducted (i.e., the primary language used in the focus groups; interviews; transcripts)
   Interviews and discussions were conducted in Hindi, the local language; transcribed into Hindi and then translated into English. Some scripts were translated by two individuals and back translated to check reliability and correctness. These details were given in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 3).

• Provide more detail on recruitment
   The selection of participants by purposive sampling was mentioned in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 3 - (page number: 5, paragraph: 1).

Results
• See revisions listed above in point 4
   Done and explanation is given above.

• Please clarify the speakers when presenting the results – the authors have lumped together responses from all participants (key informants; focus group participants; migrants; neo-migrants) – weren’t you planning to compare perspectives across groups? If so, this is not clearly articulated in the results section.
   As suggested by the reviewer, in results, the perspectives across the groups were presented. Accordingly, the results section has been reorganized.
• The authors should reconsider their presentation of themes (e.g., headings need to be revised)
The headings (themes under results) were revised, as suggested by the reviewer.

• The issue of language is referred to in the first paragraph of page 5. The authors did not clarify that the terms had the same meaning for the participants.
Hypertension is called as ‘BP’ in this community. Researchers also used ‘BP’ to refer to hypertension during interviews and discussions. These details are presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 8, paragraph: 4).

• Remove the last quote on page 5 – it takes away from the message in this Section
Done as suggested.

• Page 6: first paragraph – there seems to be some gender differences that need to be extrapolated from the data
As suggested, gender differences were extrapolated and presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 10, paragraph: 1).

• Page 6: City vs. hypertension – title is vague; what does “each of which has been linked further” mean?
The title ‘city vs. hypertension’ is removed in the revised manuscript. The revised manuscript is taken care to avoid vagueness. The sentence “each of which has been linked further” has been removed and clearer explanation is provided.

• Page 6: Pollution and adulteration: maybe add “Adulteration of Food”; remove “…along with many other problems”.
Done as suggested.

• Page 8: Participants seem to demonstrate some confusion about the symptoms of hypertension; The section entitled “Awareness of own status of hypertension” needs to be clarified
Since the phrase ‘awareness of own status of hypertension’ was confusing, this phrase was avoided. The heading was given as ‘Awareness of hypertension’. The write-up was made clear (page number: 11, paragraph: 2).

Conclusion & Discussion
• Refer to points listed above #5
Done as suggested and explanation is given above.

Other revisions
• See points listed above #6, 8, 9
Done as suggested and explanation is given above.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published.
As suggested, the manuscript is thoroughly checked for language correctness.
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests
Reviewer #3: Dr. Christiana Noestlinger

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The quality of the paper would improve if the research questions were to be presented in a more structured way. There are three different objectives, which this research addresses, but unfortunately they are lumped together in only one sentence; this makes it quite reader-unfriendly.

This study is developed based on Kleinman’s explanatory model. This model is used to unravel the people’s perceptions on hypertension. The components of these perceptions according to the model were briefly explained in the revised manuscript.

--> discretionary revision

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The method section could clearly improve. I miss a clear-cut description of the qualitative methodology applied; it is mentioned that FGDs and key informant interviews were taken, but these are mere data collection techniques and do not explain the underlying methodological approach. As with quantitative studies, scientific rigor should be applied and it should be clearly stated which methodological approach was taken. In addition, it is not clear why two types of data provision sources were used. Which different kinds of data were assessed within these two groups?

As suggested by the reviewer, the methodology section was improved. The methodological approaches of data collection techniques (for both FGDs and key informant interviews) were presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 4, paragraph: 3 - page number: 5, paragraph: 1).

Also, the justification for using two methods of data collection was given in the revised manuscript (page number: 4 , paragraph: 2).

How as the recruitment done for the FGD?
The details of recruitment of participants were presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 5, paragraph: 2).

The number of FGDs was quite low, as was the number of participants in the FGDs? Why was this the case (this is clearly a limitation of the study, which, however, is not mentioned anywhere). Where the FGDs stopped because of saturation of data, or just because of limited resources?

As suggested, it was mentioned that limited number of FGDs were taken due to limited resources. This information was presented under limitation of the study, in the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 6).

--> Major Compulsory Revisions

3. Are the data sound?
Data seem to be sound, however the methodological approach of data analysis taken is not being described (see also the comment above).
The methodological approaches of data collection techniques were presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 3-5 - page number: 8, paragraph: 1 & 2).

It is not being mentioned if any measures to safeguard accuracy when translating the data assessment tools (i.e. topic guides) and the data as such (i.e. transcripts), were in place.

As suggested by the reviewer, the methodology section was improved by providing the details of transcription, translation and methods to check linguistic reliability and correctness (page number: 7, paragraph: 3).

--> Minor essential revision

The figure aims to visualize the findings but leaves the reader quite confused. Too many codes/categories are introduced; visualization should facilitate the better understanding of complex models or constructs, but the figure fails to do so.
As reviewer opined that the figure leaves the reader confused, it was simplified. Two simple figures were presented in the revised manuscript. Also a brief description of these figures was presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 9, paragraph: 2 - page number: 10, paragraph: 2).

--> Major Compulsory Revision

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

It could improve a lot considering my remarks above on the missing scientific rigor and necessary and transparent reporting standards of qualitative data.
The procedures of management of qualitative data were presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 7, paragraph: 3-5 - page number: 8, paragraph: 1 &2).

--> Major Compulsory Revision

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion is well written and shows in how far the findings of this study are coherent with previous findings in the literature. However, it is difficult to understand how the author has developed the explanatory model (see also the figure); while the text mostly talks about individual explanations of root causes of hypertension, in the figure this is summarized as a general model derived from the research. However, the methodological approach of this induction is not explained.
Now, the findings of the study were made coherent and summarized as a model. A methodological approach of the study is inducted in the revised manuscript.

The discussion section does not address sufficiently what the most relevant findings of this study are in addition to what is already known about the problem.
In the revised manuscript, it was discussed about the findings and their implications. Also, relevant literature was referred while discussing these results.

--> Major Compulsory Revision

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No. No section in study limitations is being provided.
As suggested, limitations of the study were presented in the revised manuscript (page number: 6, paragraph: 6 - page number: 7, paragraph: 1).

--> Major Compulsory Revision

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, but no use of health seeking behavioural theories and behaviour change theories is being made.
This study is taken up following Kleinman’s explanatory model. And this is given in the revised manuscript (page number: 3, paragraph: 1).

--> Major Compulsory Revision

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey?
Yes.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
As suggested, the manuscript is thoroughly checked for language correctness.

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

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.