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#### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<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>Minor REVISION comments</td>
<td>Several minor corrections are required. They are suggested in the paper. It is necessary to standardize the writing of results and units of measurement. In some places are written “unit of measure / ha”, and in other places “unit of measure ha”(^{-1}). Uniformization is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional/General comments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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