

Reply to comment

Thank for suggestion for improvement of the article. All suggestions are followed and revision is in red.

For point by point response, details are given below

Comment from reviewer 1

The title is vague based on the fact that the topic has been dealt with by another author, therefore it is important to revise the topic to reflect the population of concerned that the manuscript will be addressing, as well as the additional knowledge that the manuscript will highlight to its readers. Also, the letter to the editor did not state the method of study, which makes it difficult to understand depth of what the authors of the manuscript will be highlighting and how this manuscript will be a novel contribution to this topic.

Reply: thank for the suggestion and attached file. The revision is done.

1. Title/topic of the article is already changed.
2. This is a correspondence letter discussing on the published article in the journal, not a report on new original finding. The discussion on the method of the study in the discussed paper by Song et al. is provided the novel contribution is on the discussed pointed adding to the primary report by Song et al.

Comment from reviewer 2

The grammar errors should be checked and revised.

Reply: grammar errors should be checked and revised.