

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for your constructive comments to further strengthen the paper and make it more valuable and easier to be understood. We appreciate the time and effort spent by you to enhance this paper.

Regards,

Prof. Biswajeet Pradhan

(Corresponding author)

The response:

1. Authors' explanations about tool include low level programing details.

Answer from Author:

Dear reviewer. Thank you for the comment. Actually, another section was added (2.2 code description (line 288-317)) which explains the code generally. Based on your comment, three figures were added which represent the flowchart of the codes.

2. Actually, they should give algorithms in the form of chart or pseudo code, not real code. They should clarify their design constraints and criteria.

Answer from Author:

Thanks for the comment. Amended as suggested and the three charts were added.

3. Same point was also emphasized by authors while giving responses to my comments. But still, manuscript has no directive or informative explanation, which is presented in the standard way (flow chart, component diagram, use case diagram or anything else) about the proposed tool.

Answer from Author:

Thank you for the comment. Another section was added (2.2 code description) which explains the code generally. Moreover, and based on your comment, three figures were added which represent the flowchart of the codes.