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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
1. There are few grammatical and typographical errors are noted in the manuscript and it should be carried throughout the manuscript. For example, the words “on examine” may be as “on examining”; “Total 1,821” as “A total of 1,821”; “design,” as “designs,”; “time,“.
2. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, Newcastle-Ottawa Scale - NOS). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript.
3. In the introduction, the authors may be given the recent updates since the authors given the data up to December 2020 only.
4. The introduction part is presented in very brief and still there is a big gap in between the current study and existing literature. Authors are therefore suggested to expand the literature search to include more recent and relevant literature in the introduction section.
5. The term “in vitro” should be italic which is used in the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the materials and methods.
6. The figure legends should be improved and a proper footnote should be given. All legends should have enough description for a reader to understand the figure without having to refer back o the main text of the manuscript. The authors should provide more information in the figure legends for non-experts.