

Editor's Comment:

The subject of the Review manuscript is of obvious practical interest.

Yet, despite the Authors claims, I hardly find in the revised version of the manuscript a clear demonstration of their taking into consideration the Reviewers demands of improvement of the original Manuscript.

While I agree that (some) of the suggestions of Reviewers may not be accepted by the Authors, this can be admitted only provided that Authors: 1) *explicitly recognized* that they contest (some) Reviewers demands and 2) that such refusal is justifiable and then *correctly and explicitly argued* by the Authors.

Incidentally, I well notice that in the revised version of the Manuscript, the Tables are numbered from 1 to 5 (whereas they were from 1 to 4 in the original version) but only thanks to the fact that the Tables originally numbered 2 to 4 have been artificially renumbered 3 to 5 in the revised version, while, accordingly no Table has n° 2 !!! So that, despite the appearance, the revised version still encompasses the same only 4 tables as in the original version ...

Thus, to conclude I strongly invite the Authors to take in due consideration the remarks above, that is either:

- 1) propose relevant arguments against (if any) non-accepted suggestions of Reviewers or, else,
- 2) correctly take into consideration the Reviewers demands and make the corresponding corrections in the revised version of the manuscript **very explicit** by underlining in yellow these corrections – as, indeed, is prescribed in the Advices to Authors of the Journal.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Jean Beguinot
University of Burgundy, France.