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| EDITORIAL COMMENT’S on revised paper (if any) | Authors’ response to editor’s comments |
| 1. It is seen that the manuscript has not been revised to the extent of the peer review suggestion, and no rebuttal was provided if it did not have to. Hence, the manuscript cannot be accepted at this level of revision. It is also suggested that all the modifications made to the original manuscript need to be marked in the revised manuscript.

Please discuss statistical analysis, 1-way ANOVA or significant difference test to see the differences in each parameter scientifically.The discussion is too narrow and little, please add. 4. The discussion of this research tends to only review the numbers about the results of observation data. This certainly needs to be updated, including a discussion of why, how, why, when and where.All of these sections are discussed comprehensively. The language created must be arranged neatly and structured.Please modify the paper as per reviewer’s comments | **The results are discussed statistically, whether on par or inferior or superior as per the ANOVA****The discussion part has been attempted to be improved by adding the proper reasoning wherever feasible.****All possible efforts have been made to improve the manuscript as per the suggestions.** |