### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link: [http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory REVISION comments** | 1. In Table 6, Values (%) are not clear. Describe the values and %.
2. The following references were in the text but not in the reference list
   • Rêgo et al. [23].
   • Tocher
   • SINGH's Methodology (1981) /SINGH [19]
   • SANTOS et al. [17]
3. The following references were not in the reference list
   • 5 and 23 ??????
4. The following references were not in the text
   • [5]
   • 17. Singh D |
| **Minor REVISION comments** | Revisions has to be done as above comments |
| **Optional/General comments** | |

### PART 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</td>
<td><em>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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