

Editorial Comment's on revised paper (if any)	Authors' Response to editor's comments
<p>1. The abstract is more than 250 words and should preferably be limited to maximum 250 words.</p> <p>2. Considerable number of scientific writing mistakes which are highlighted in the revised manuscript. For example: (i) Presentation of the results in a table and also in the text, (ii) Table 3 not appropriately presented but reviewed by the editorial board to ease its revision by the authors.</p> <p>3. Great mistake for citations in the text using figures.</p> <p>4. The F statistics and the comparison of means were performed without prior description in the section "Materials and methods".</p> <p>5. Recommendations are the last part of a conclusion. Therefore, the section of the manuscript is simply named "<u>Conclusion</u>" not "Conclusion and recommendations" like in the case of a Report.</p> <p>Authors are advised to take into consideration all the above listed comments and others contained on the revised manuscript, attached herewith this e-mail.</p>	<p>- Abstract is now reduced less than 250 words</p> <p>- corrected as indicated</p> <p>- corrected as indicated</p> <p>- F statistics and LSD now described in the "Materials and methods".</p> <p>- corrected as indicated</p> <p>- Instruction is noted is and complied with.</p>