Reviewers Comments-

Reviewer #3: The author has given a very small introduction, it lacks objectives, background and problem statement, please elaborate all these things. Conclusion should be separate from discussion. Please explained your discussion in details. All your references need to be properly formatted otherwise it is an interesting topic to consider.

I have gone through the paper, it needs to be revised according to the journal style. English is poor and there is a need to revise thoroughly. Introduction is too short. Methodology is not very clear. Some references are outdated.

paper needs thorough revision for formatting and there are English grammatical errors.

I found out that some of the equations are not validated, please have a look at them again.

References need to be revised and reformatted

Please send your abstract on the template provided by conference organizers

 Provide the names and address of all contributing authors.

Provide keywords.

Reviewer #1: The study looks interesting however in my view the author should thoroughly check the paper again before re-submission. The problem statement and objectives are not clearly defined. At the end of the introduction, it would be helpful to offer a brief, clear statement of the objective of this study. Such a statement would provide a transition to the main ideas being presented. The main body of text is relatively concise given the wide range of topics covered. However, the text is somewhat disjointed and disorganized. The use of headings for sections and sub-sections is not clear and leads to confusion. The various sections of the main body of text do not seem to flow very smoothly. Please consider the overall structure of the paper to ensure that similar sections are taken together. Conclusion section could be improved to better reflect the large amount of information reviewed in relation to the title/objective of the paper. In my view, the conclusions should be expanded to better summarize the overall "feel" of the main review section to give the reader a strong message. Some of the references are outdated

Reviewer #2: Interesting study but I have following concerns on the papers.

1- Aims & objectives of study is lacking

2- Introduction is brief.

3- Methodology not clear. Please check your simulation properly.

4- Conclusion is not clear

5- References are too old.

I suggest thorough revision of the whole paper and format according to journal specific format .

**Reviewer #4:**

**1.**      Abstract should be limited to 200 words.

**2.**      Keywords should not be the repetitions of the title words, please find such words which are not in the title, this way search engines of the web will find your manuscript with higher probability.

**3.**      Suggestions for improvements in the Title

***4.***      The structure of scientific publication should include the general chapters (Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion). Please follow instructions on journal webpage. Conclusion section is missing.

**5.**      Recommendations for future studies are needed in the conclusion section. Kindly provide strong recommendations for future researches.

**6.**      Some citations are missing from the References section.

**7.**      Some references are not cited in the text.

**8.**      The language quality of the manuscript is insufficient, it should be improved with the help of a spell-checker.

**9.**      Why is the study important and what benefit can the readers derive from this study?

**10.**  Formatting does not match journal criteria. (e.g. References section; title spacing; paragraph indents)