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:

### 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**

**Minor REVISION comments**

**Abstract**
The abstract does not speak or represent the true summary of the paper. There are many stories/irrelevant in the abstract. The abstract should addressed the following questions:

a. What you do  
b. The way you do it i.e. methods used  
c. Results gotten – present facts and figures

**Results and Analysis**

a. The title should be “Results and Discussions” not “Results and analysis”  
b. The author should give percentage variations when comparing the outcome of the methods used

**Conclusion and Discussions**

a. The title should be “Conclusion”  
b. The author should remove discussions from the title and re-write the conclusion

**Optional/General comments**
The author should re-write the abstract and the conclusion.
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