Response to Reviewer 2 Comments
(Round 2)

Dear reviewer,

thank you very much for your time and your insightful comments and remarks that lead to improvement of the content and presentation of the paper. Please find below your comment (in black) and the corresponding answer (in red).

**Point:** After carefully this revised paper reading, I cannot be persuaded that it has been significantly improved. As a reviewing paper, the most important and difficult work is that the depth of surveying should be helpful for other scholars’ research. However, this paper is lack of valuable comments because of the missing of applications background supporting. In my opinion, reviewing paper is better for those who had finished at least some related researches.

**Response:** We would like to point out that we have conducted a wide review of existing solutions in the studied field. We are not yet applying clustering algorithms to some specified fields which is indeed considered in future work, once the classification has been done according to our 10 parameters.

Regards,
Damien WOHWE SAMBO,
Blaise Omer YENKE,
Anna FÖRSTER,
Paul DAYANG.