**The authors are grateful to the reviewer for valuable comments and suggestions for the improvement of the manuscript.**

**Reviewer 1:**

The paper requires changes.

I suspect this is a fair representation of the presentation. As such, it should be included in the proceedings. However, beforehand, some changes/improvements are necessary.

In connection with "diquarks", the authors may benefit from considering the following article
"Diquark correlations in hadron physics: Origin, impact and evidence, M. Yu. Barabanov et al., Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 116 (2021) 103835 • e-Print: 2008.07630 [hep-ph]"
Ref. [9] is not representative of modern perspectives.

**Corrections have been made at appropriate place.**

The title of Sec. 2 should be "Method". Despite widespread misuse, "Methodology" is properly the study of method = the theoretical analysis of the methods appropriate to a field of study or to the body of methods and principles particular to a branch of knowledge. A "Method" is the approach used in a particular study and that is the meaning intended by these authors.

The author's so-called Regge trajectory plots do not display Regge trajectories. Almost all lines with more than 2 points appear to favour nonlinear trajectories. So, I do not see the point the authors are trying to make. Does their model predict linear Regge trajectories or are they trying to suggest that straight lines are some sort of simplified representation of their results on some limited domains? For a broader perspective, the authors may consider the following article
"Properties of Regge trajectories, Alfred Tang, John W. Norbury, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 016006 • e-Print: hep-ph/0004078 [hep-ph]"
and some of the articles that cite it.

 **Here, the mass obtained through the potential model has been plotted and linearly fitted. It is a representation aimed to help in predicting the spin-parity assignment of yet unknown states. Also, new references have been included in the manuscript.**

The formatting of the list of references is clumsy. It should be corrected. For instance, all author lists should begin the same distance from the citation number and double commas should be removed.

Tables 1 and 2. The source of experimental results is represented by [?]. It seems the LaTeX citation is incorrect.

**Changes are incorporated within the manuscript including the references.**