

### **Editor's Comments :**

Thank You for Your attention

My suggestion is "minor revision" for this manuscript, after carefully reading the reviewers' comments and going through the latest revised manuscript "Revised-ms\_PSIJ\_19833\_v4.doc", for the following reasons:

The presentation is still not good with the reviewers' comments "Review the entire document and correct the issue, and grammar and misspelled words stuck". The authors mainly corrected whatever the reviewers pointed out, but did not actually review the entire document. Overall, as stated by the reviewers, the authors need to polish the manuscript before it is good enough for publication. Besides the reviewers' comments, I have some comments:

- (a). In lines 157, 210 - 212, the authors uses two different font size, any reason? Please correct them.
- (b). The authors directly use some abbreviations without giving any description about what they stand for, like OC, SF, etc, which makes it much harder to follow.
- (c). I suggest the authors to number all formulas for better reference, but not just two of them.
- (d). Presentation!!! Just an example, in lines 95-96, there is no reason to go to a new line without finish the sentence

"various measurement conditions  
and to control working elements.

"

### **Author's Feedback:**

- (a). In lines 157, 210 - 212, We corrected the font size.
- (b). We replace the OC –by differential negative drag, SF – by spectrum fluorescence in all manuscript
- (c). We numbered all formulas in the manuscript.
- (d). in line 95 – 96 We corrected this section as "various measurement conditions and to control working elements