SCIENCEDOMAIN international





SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
The most important problem is lacking statistical analysis of the obtained results	We have added the required statistical analysis
that makes those results not reliable, as without statistical analysis with use of appropriate tests (Microsoft ExceITM 2016 is not a tool for evaluation of	We have improved the result section
statistical significance of differences between mean values and percentages for particular data) the results does not support the conclusions.	We have added future perspective
Moreover in the "Results" chapter the description of the results in all tables should be presented in more details.	Comments from one of the reviewers were suggestions for further studies, which we humbly welcomed.
The last problem is that the Authors did not included in revised version 1 the future perspective for the study suggested by one of reviewers and any of valuable remarks suggested by the second reviewer.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.5 (4th August, 2012)