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Reviewer 1

Paper Summary:

Have authors revised the paper by taking account of all relevant comments from ALL reviewers?: 
Yes, authors have taken account of all relevant comments.

Please explain which comments of reviewers the authors missed out, and how they should have considered those comments?

- 

Please comment on the quality of the revised paper? Is the paper worth publishing at this stage? Have any new problems come up in the revised paper?:

The paper is now much better. I think it will be interesting for the readership.
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Paper Summary:

Have authors revised the paper by taking account of all relevant comments from ALL reviewers?:

Authors have taken account of some relevant comments, but some comments are not considered.

Please explain which comments of reviewers the authors missed out, and how they should have considered those comments?:

Much still need to be done to improve the quality of writing.

Please comment on the quality of the revised paper? Is the paper worth publishing at this stage? Have any new problems come up in the revised paper?:

I think the paper is okay now except that the grammar need to be improved upon.

Any other feedback for authors:

Pay attention to all that were annotated in the manuscript.

Recommended Minor Revisions?:

Thorough reading should be done to correct the writing mistakes and to improve the grammar. Once this is done, I think the paper will be publishable.
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