Editor's Comment:

I have carefully read the manuscript, its revision version and experts' comments. Although all the reviewers agree this manuscript can be accepted in our journal at present, I think the quality of this paper can be also improved. Therefore, I suggest that this manuscript should be revised before the formal publication. Therefore, my decision is "**Minor revision**". The following is my comment for the current version.

Both Nigeria and China are populous countries. Although I am not an expert in this field, I am also interested in the topic of this paper. My research interest is image encryption and watermarking. I hope author can consider my suggestions to further improve the quality of his or her manuscript.

(1) The author is suggested to add the paper organization structure as the last paragraph in the introduction section. E.g., "The rest of paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is the theoretical principle. A new MIE algorithm is presented in Section 3. Section 4 introduces two similar existing algorithms. Experiments and algorithm analyses are given in Section 5. Conclusions are drawn in Section 6."

(2) The reference mark is not enough. E.g., Equation (5) should mark a reference. In my opinion, this model is proposed by others, and not proposed by the author.

(3) In the introduction section, the author is suggested to make a literature review. He /she should points out the problems or disadvantages existed in the existing models, such as the official, exponential and logistic growth models. If one of these models can well predict the population growth in Nigeria, author's research work becomes meaningless.

(4) The author is suggested to try to find the real population data in Nigeria, and make every models referred in this papers comparisons with the real population data. Meanwhile, the author can show their comparative results with figures. If the difference between the real data and predicted data generated by author's model is smaller than other existing model, the author's model is better.

(5) The author is suggested to answer the reviewer's comments one by one in detail. The answer "OK" is too brief. Here I offer him or her an example, "Response letter.pdf". I hope the author can learn something from this file.

(6) Don't use the modest phrases in the academic paper. The first sentence in the conclusion section, "This work has attempted to suggest a model" are suggested to revise as "This work establishes a new model."

(7) Don't draw the ambiguous phrases conclusion in the academic paper. E.g., The sentences in the conclusion section. "Models represent something that look real and relevant in our

estimation, but they are just abstractions that must never be confused with the reality we are trying to mimic. Hence, if the outcome of prediction by our models does not reflect what we see or measure in the real world, it is the model that will need to be re-examined, and not the real world." Author should points out that whether he or she established model can predict the population growth in Nigeria or not. If it can do, the author is suggested to offer the error rate or range.

(8) There are some typos. E.g., "[6.Hathout]" should be "[6]".

<u>Editor's Details:</u>

Dr. Xiaoqiang Zhang
School of Information and Control Engineering, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou, China