**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 | - Please note that the reference list and the whole manuscript must conform strictly to the Guide for Authors.  
- References are old. The author can use new references in literature review. |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | Typographical error :  
- In page 2, line 231, « 6. References » change to « 5. References ». Please check and correct. |
| **Optional/General** comments | The paper is well organized and written. However, requires further initial discussion.  
- Please note that the reference list and the whole manuscript must conform strictly to the Guide for Authors.  
- In general, No technical errors and approved for publication. |
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