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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors,

Thank you for your advice on our manuscript. We made some changes according to your advice. Here are the response to your advice.

1. Authors' contributions

   a) Please represent authors' names using their full initials, not their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section. For example, the initials of Kunjie Wang would be ‘KJ’. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors, for example, by adding their middle name initial.

   b) We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of authors Kunjie Wang, Hong Li, Xin Wei and Deyi Luo, as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to manuscript editing and project development, alone, does not usually justify authorship.
Response: We changed the full names of all authors to initials. And, we justified the contribution of Kunjie Wang, Hong Li, Xin Wei and Deyi Luo. Actually, they contributed more than what previously mentioned in the manuscript.

2. Conclusions section

Please add a separate “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion” section. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research article and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance.

Response: We draw the conclusion in the last paragraph of our discussion section. We add a separate "conclusion" section and moved the last paragraph to this section.

3. Remove highlighting/clean copy

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.

Response: We removed the highlights and comments in the last revision. Now, it is a clean copy.

Overall, thank you so much for taking your precious time on revising and pointing out the mistakes that occurred in our manuscript. This is also a very valuable fortune to me! I learnt a lot following your suggestions!

We appreciate for editors and reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Kunjie Wang
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