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PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsory REVISION comments</strong></td>
<td>What is the rationale behind your choice of unequal numbers of items (100 and 50) in a comparative study like this? Table 6 was only mentioned but not discussed. Supply keys to your symbols in tables 2 and 6. Recast the heighted parts of your abstract to portray the information you intend to state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor REVISION comments</strong></td>
<td>Avoid the use of unscientific words like thank God, may be, probably in scientific research Replace “best before” with expiry date Your statements in lines 241 to 242, 246 and 269 are political, please support them with literature? Perhaps that is why your references are few. Replace the word survey under recommendation with appropriate word. Ensure you proof read your articles before submission in order to avoid some of the mistakes that are highlighted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional/General comments: Good work
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