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| Optional/General comments | The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to its field, offering novel insights and a clear scientific methodology. The experimental design is well-structured, and the results are presented logically, supporting the stated objectives. However, a more detailed discussion on potential limitations and future research directions could further strengthen the manuscript. Additionally, ensuring all figures and tables are accompanied by thorough explanations will enhance clarity for the readers. Overall, this work holds significant potential for advancing the current understanding of the topic.  While the manuscript may have potential, there are significant aspects that require improvement, such as language quality, clarity in the presentation of results, or the robustness of the scientific methods. After addressing these issues, the manuscript could be suitable for publication. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Details:** | |
| Name: | **Afef Dhaffouli** |
| Department, University & Country | **University of Gafsa, Tunisia** |