

Response to Reviewer's comments

Reviewer 1:

Specific Comments to Authors:

The overall goal of this paper is interesting but several parts of this review lacks precision and some writing is needed. The introduction is very general and quite poor. The real topic of this review should be highlighted and detailed. The presentation of the bibliography is correct even if some sentences are difficult to understand. The conclusion is very poor, this is not a conclusion but rather a summary. No hypothesis are proposed and this conclusion has no interest.

Response to Reviewer's comments

As suggested by the Reviewer we have made the following changes in the manuscript

1. Modified the 'Introduction' to make it more precise (page 4 , para 1 &2)
2. Included a hypothesis in page 17
3. Added a figure to represent the hypothesis (Figure 2)
4. Corrected the grammar using 'Grammarly Inc.' software