Reviewer’s Report:

1. Does the paper present the selected problem/system/phenomenon clearly and concisely in the Introduction?

This paper does a good job introducing an important difficulty and expresses a new improved method of overcoming the obstacle. It lacks a clear direction of what the paper is going to explain though. It would have been nice to see where paper was heading.

2. Does the Method section summarize the details of the reviewed/presented/employed experimental techniques and theoretical methods?

Overall this section was good. It would have been nice to see a little more explanation on how these different methods would be useful in the analysis such what kind of important information will this method divulge.

3. Where the conclusions clearly presented and supported by the presented Results, Analysis, and Discussion sections?

Not really. I was a little lost on what the paper was trying to convey. The analysis explained the graphs, but not the relevance to the new system. The discussion lacks does not give really any other conclusion then it is a better system. According to the paper, this is a result of lack of sound references. I feel that I was let down when I reached the end of the paper. It would have been better to have a more conclusive subject.

4. Are the references of the independent study well incorporated in the text and used to support or contrast statements/observations?

All references were used efficiently and there were a sufficient number.

5. Was the independent study carefully prepared regarding text formatting, figures, and tables?

The text formatted was very easy to follow and figures and tables were explained clearly and concisely.