



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>Some corrections are shown in the article with red color.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although the models using at the manuscript have very old date (1965, 1978,1990, 1992, 1994), only 3 (14-16) sources are included in the discussion. the discussion section is pretty weak. 2. Picture 1 and 2 have the same data with Table 3. 3. No need repetition of data in the manuscript. One of the table or figures should be preferred. 4. "." should be used instead of "," at numerical data in all text. 5. "Fig." should be used instead of "Picture" 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although the models using at the manuscript have very old date (1965, 1978,1990, 1992, 1994), only 3 (14-16) sources are included in the discussion. the discussion section is pretty weak. <p>Three more papers were added in the bibliographic review, to which our discussions are encouraged.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Picture 1 and 2 have the same data with Table 3. No need repetition of data in the manuscript. One of the table or figures should be preferred. <p>The figures were excluded, leaving only Table 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. "." should be used instead of "," at numerical data in all text. <p>All substitutions were made in the numerical body of the text from "," to ".".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. "Fig." should be used instead of "Picture" <p>Picture by figure was replaced</p>