

## **Answering reviewers**

**Peer-review report(s).** Authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and provide point-by-point responses to each of the issues raised in the peer-review report(s):

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade E (Do not publish)

**Language Quality:** Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

### **Specific Comments to Authors:**

the manuscript requires the following to be more acceptable; 1 Abstract. the abstract too short to reflect the work described in the manuscript.

*Many thanks for this comment. The author guidelines stipulate a 200 word limit which is why the abstract was this length. However, we have increased this to reflect this particular comment.*

1 Background. the manuscript inadequately describes the background of the study

*This section has been rewritten which we hope will satisfy the reviewers.*

2 . 3. Methods. the manuscript insufficient describe methods, data analysis and clinical trials, etc.

*This section has been rewritten which we hope will satisfy the reviewers. As this is an editorial, data analysis is not relevant.*

3 4 Discussion. the manuscript inadequate interpret the findings or highlighting the key points.

*This section has been rewritten which we hope will satisfy the reviewers.*

4 5 Illustrations and tables. No figures, diagrams, or tables support the displayed ideas or findings.

*We do not feel that figures are necessary or with support the text given we would need to reference/gain permission from authors of other papers.*

5 6 References. Insufficient.

*We have increased the reference list so we hope that this satisfies this comment.*

6 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript needs language and grammar editing in which case their manuscript will be more fluent.

*The manuscript has been completely rewritten and hope this is to the satisfaction of the reviewers.*