

# For research article

## Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

### 1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files.

| 2. Questions for General Evaluation                                                      | Reviewer's Evaluation                               | Response and Revisions                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references? | Can be improved                                     | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |
| Are all the cited references relevant to the research?                                   | Can be improved                                     | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |
| Is the research design appropriate?                                                      | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |
| Are the methods adequately described?                                                    | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |
| Are the results clearly presented?                                                       | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |
| Are the conclusions supported by the results?                                            | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | <i>I have given my corresponding response.</i> |

### 3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

**Comments 1:** 1. All the acronyms should be defined before their first appearance in the text i.e. SEM and many other

**Response 1:** *Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. All acronyms are defined, such as SEM, XRD, XPS, etc.*

**Comments 2:** 2. The boundary conditions of model used in 2.2.4 should be clearly indicate as well as all other loading and mesh process.

**Response 2:** *Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. We have modified it in the article.*

**Comments 3:** 3. The text should be checked for different typos "in CWO1, This suggests " "of CWO1 is relatively high" in respect to what – as well as a quantitative description is required "can achieve ideal optical properties 291 after appropriate ball milling time2 not sure if ideal properties can be claimed rather than may be it will be worth indicating that the condition achieved is

*lined with the targeted properties.*

**Response 3:** *Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. We have made targeted modifications to the corresponding locations in the article*

**Comments 4:** 4.

*Some recent literature is required as it can demonstrate the novelty of the work, as now many of the literature stated are very old..*

**Response 4:** *Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. We have added nearly ten new references to the Introduction section*

#### **4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language**

**Point 1:**

**Response 1:** I have already revised the grammar of my manuscript.

#### **5. Additional clarifications**

*[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]*

