General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory REVISION comments** | - Line 3: As suggested for the title.  
- Introduction needs to be improved on.  
- References should be numbered serially in the text beginning with the first as [1] and so on, then listed accordingly at the end of the manuscript (according to author guidelines of the journal)  
- References cited are too few and not too current  
- Processing or preparation of the samples for analysis should be provided |
| **Minor REVISION comments** | - These are standard procedures and need not to be so detailed  
- It is good for the findings/discussion to be reported in past tense  
- Line 69: check tense and all through the text  
- Line 173: Incomplete sentence  
- Line 176: p<0.05?  
- Line 183: See comment  
- Line 194: See comment  
- Line 195: See comment |
| **Optional/General comments** | |

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20
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