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Reviewer's report:

1) The abstract is the face of any article and has to be properly written.

2) The conclusion does not explain as to which method is superior to the other.

3) Kindly, avoid mentioning keywords from the title.

4) Kindly, rename 'background' as 'introduction' in the case file.

5) 'Aims and objectives' to be mentioned in the abstract.

6) References to mentioned at several places in the introduction.

7) The introduction is unnecessarily long and needs to be made to only what is relevant. Unnecessary points to be excluded.

8) 'Aims and objectives' have to be mentioned in the case file.

9) The introduction the flow of data needs to be continuous and understandable.

10) The materials and methods can be better presented.

11) Images can be added to improve and support the study at hand.

12) Graphs and line diagrams can be added to improve the presentation of the results.
13) The discussion is unnecessarily long and unnecessary points need to be avoided only relevant points need to be mentioned.

14) The conclusion is the final inference from the study at hand and has to be summarised in one or two lines.

15) All the references need to be mentioned in Vancouver format and have to be not over 18 years old; if so have to be updated.

16) Avoid the term 'et al' in the references and the names of all the authors need to be mentioned.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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