



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT’S on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to editor’s comments
<p>1. Two of the keywords duplicate the same as in the paper title. Other selections should be re-chosen.</p> <p>2. Headings used in the text do not need to be put in quotations.</p> <p>3. Some typing/spelling errors have been detected. A thorough proof-check is highly recommended.</p> <p>4. Most table data included two administrative divisions: Hisar and Bhiwani. But, in the text, only Hisar and Rohtak are mentioned. Which two divisions are correct?</p> <p>5. Since the statistical data are given for two divisions, it is a tremendous pity not to compare results from these two divisions! Any significant difference exists between them? In fact, the whole manuscript emphasizes results from the total 200 samples. In this case, all the tables must be modified accordingly.</p> <p>6. The most critical comment from one of the reviewer has not been properly addressed: The authors do not present if the study was approved by a research ethics committee in "Material and methods". The “ethics” is entirely different than the answer provided by the author(s) concerning just the advising professors.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Noted and revised</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Corrected</p>