

Reply to the reviewers

We thank the editor and the reviewers for their time and effort in reviewing our manuscript. We were pleased to receive their thoughtful comments on our manuscript and would like to respond to them as follows:

Science editor comments

(1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

We provided the original figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

(2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout

We added the PMID and DOI numbers to the reference list and listed all authors of the references.

(3) The reference's number cited in the text should be superscript.

The reference numbers were cited in the text as superscript.

Specific Comments to Authors

The paper is an interesting report, well written and it is presented in a proper form. Indeed, the process of peer-review is not easy and needs improvements. In order to have a complete view of this proposal I suggest to mention if there are disadvantages or not in using this new platform, like inherent malfunction of the platform or the possibility of difficult access for all the editors or reviewers.

Response: Thank you for the favorable appraisal of our manuscript. We agree with the reviewer on this comment and we added the possible disadvantages of this new platform as the reviewer suggested.