

EDITORIAL COMMENTS:

Here are some clear mistakes they should check during reviewing:

Abstract: should start with the general sentence following material and methods then findings and the last one concluding the abstract by one sentence.

Line 15 to 17 should be in the conclusion section.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Collection of Samples

The survey sites were visited in November 2012 **this is questionable where were the authors all this time? Why they didn't write and submit the paper before.**

Analyzing data is wrong because error bars are same they have to change it and reanalyze the data.

Discussion part is short and not strong.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Unclear and they didn't show the importance of the article.

References double check and to be sure to include all the references from the manuscript in the reference section.

AUTHOR'S COMMENTS:

1. On collection of samples, why the work was not sent for publication since 2012?

We could not get a suitable publishing medium before now but the larger issue was paucity of funds

Data Analysis: The data has been reanalyzed and the bars in appropriate figure corrected as directed by the Editor

All the queries by the Editor have been addressed in the text from Abstract to the references section.

Discussion has been beefed up as suggested by the Editor

Conclusion and Recommendation section has been improved on.

The references have been double checked in the text and the Reference list and found to be correct.