

Reviewer # 1

| Reviewer Comments | Authors Response |
|---|---|
| <p>This manuscript is generally satisfactory, but the literature review as well as the discussion section are too brief and many relevant literature are not covered, and the authors are advised to further revise the literature review and discussion. 1. Specify what makes this article different from the rest of studies that are available in the literature. 2. Identify the gap in exiting literature, by arguing what is missing or inadequate in existing solutions and thus your study is necessary. This needs to be briefly noted in Introduction, and then further elaborated in the Literature Review, with in-depth analysis and substantiation of citations. 3. It would be helpful in clarifying the importance of the proposed study if the paper can include references to some latest articles published in recent years within the scope of the current research. 4. Discussion of results/findings, needs to related to previous literature and compare and contrast the findings/claims against that of previous studies.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thank you for your feedback.2. The background section emphasize the importance of this study.3. The study gap is identified and reflected in the introduction section.4. The discussion section is updated. |

Reviewer # 2

| Reviewer Comments | Authors Response |
|---|---|
| <p>Need more statistical methods to surpport the author's conclusion, English writing should be improved.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thank you for your feedback.2. The Manuscript has been run on English software to remove grammatical mistakes.3. The statistical methods section is updated. |