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Technical Comments:

Editor Comments:

1. Please confirm whether your study was submitted to and approved by your institutional ethics committee and include a statement to this effect in your Methods section. Please also ensure that the full name of your ethics committee is included in this statement. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations,
please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations.

AUTHOR RESPONSE: THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENT. A WRITTEN STATEMENT BY THE INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS COMMITTEE TOGETHER WITH A STUDY NUMBER WERE OBTAINED. FULL NAME OF THE IRB AND STUDY NUMBER WERE ADDED TO THE METHODS AND DECLARATION SECTION.

2. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

AUTHOR RESPONSE: THANK YOU. A CLEAN VERSION OF THE MANUSCRIPT AND ALL FIGURES WAS UPLOADED.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 3): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors did a great work on addressing the issues raised. They also added relevant sections in the introduction, methods and discussion to address these."

AUTHOR RESPONSE: THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND WORDS AND HELPING TO IMPROVE OUR MANUSCRIPT.