The authors are grateful to the Reviewer for the valuable comments and positive assessment of the article. All comments of the Reviewer are taken into account in the new version of the article.

All corrections were filled by yellow color.

Detailed answers to all Reviewers' comments

1. “In general, this manuscript is correctly structured, however, English language have to be checked and improved”.

English language was checked and improved.

2. “Introduction should be expanded with more detailed literature review”.

New references were added. Literature review was extended.

3. “It is recommended to expand results and discussion section. Compare with  
other researchers’ findings”.

Results and discussion part was extended.

4. “It is important to include a short discussion on the reliability of the  
results and model reported herein”.

The methods of mathematical statistics and procedure according the reliability of the results and model were added

5. “A better explanation of Figures 6-8 should be given”.

Additional explanation of Figures 6-8 was added.

6. “The quality of the Figures (including legends and axes labeling) are not  
quite satisfactory. The quality Figures should be better”.   
Figures with poor duality were corrected. New version of these figures was uploaded.

7. “Figures 1 and 2 lack the appropriate symbols and units on the x and y  
axes”.

Figures 1 and 2 was corrected.

8. Row 159: put literature citation in proper form.

Reference was corrected.

9. Row 209: unclear sentence.

Sentence was corrected.

10. “Table 1 as well as its explanation should be moved from the conclusions to  
the discussion section”.  
Table 1 was replaced to the discussion section.

11. “It is recommended to add a list of symbols at the end of the manuscript,  
because some symbols are not well explained or not explained at all through  
text”.

List of symbols was added at the end of manuscript.