

Response to reviewers

Comment

“The manuscript reads good now, and I would suggest publication of the paper following another technical check. For example, Schiebel et al (2004) is cited in the text but the reference is not given in the list of references, and all citations may be cross-checked. Also, some numbers are floating in the list of references, and are possibly leftovers from copy-and-paste.”

Response

We are thankful to the reviewer for providing a quick response to our manuscript and we are indeed glad to see the revised manuscript is approved by the reviewer. We have also detected the mistakes in referencing pointed out by the reviewer and we are sorry about this. Now in the revised manuscript, the missing reference has been added and also the number that was remaining from the past format in a reference was deleted. We have cross-checked the references in the list as well as in the text.

We highly appreciate the quick action of the handling editor and hope that the present version of our manuscript is acceptable for publication.