**Editor’s Comment:**

I analysed the process in detail, and I noticed that the reviewer requests very only cosmetic changes, and did not address the technical part of the paper.

Actually, this is a review paper, with added responsibility for quality. This paper is considered a comprehensive review, but it only has 12 references. I would expect a number around 100 or more references. Moreover, the discussion of the subjects is shallow, resulting in a mini-paper that is not agreeable with a comprehensive review. Thus, to preserve the integrity of the Journal I regret to recommend rejection of this paper.
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