



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_8550
Title of the Manuscript:	The characteristics of the of water vapor in micrometer gap sizes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Must be support the methodology part with some of process flow diagram 2. The results should be more and more clear with different conditions	All the Referee's comments were included in the revised manuscript. We would like to thank the Referee for help us to improve our manuscript. 1. We completely agree, so in the experimental set up we added the following part: "Both electrodes were equipped with dielectric cap (immune to vacuum, dielectric breakdown strength =13, 8 kV/mm) to prevent the ignition of the discharge at longer path at low pressures. The the electrode surface has been polished by the finest diamond paste (0.25 μm grain size) in order to achieve the average roughness of the electrode better then 0.25 μm and measured by using SEM." 2. The breakdown voltage curve shown in Fig. 2 or V-I characteristics shown in Fig. 4 were recorded for various parameters. We agree that we did not emphasizes so we revised the Figures captions to contain more details.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The introduction part not cover enough studies regarding the article work 2. The article need to follow " instruction for authors" for this journal	1. We agree. We modified the 2nd paragraph in the Introduction to be more related to the manuscript. 2. We agree. We revised the manuscript in accordance with the journal's template.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Most of the references (old) less than 2010 2. The language should be checked by expert man	We agree, but it recently attracted much attention. We added recent papers about water vapour from 2011 [8] and 2012 [9]. We added reference from 2013 [2] and with reference from 2012 [1] we have 4 references (from 9) younger than 2010. We agree and one of our colleagues, who is an expert, checked the manuscript.
---	--	--