



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012_PRR1_2965
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic of laser induced Li II plasma

**General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:**

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2:** 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Each parameter should be clearly defined. In the present form, it is impossible to follow the argument. Simplified schematic and the dimension of the plasma system (both experiment by Doria and the model the authors used) must be presented. The authors argue that at larger <math>d</math> the plasma is cooled down. However, in Fig 1, the temperature (is it in thermal equilibrium in this range? Or which temperature is it?) increases until <math>d = 2</math> mm. The authors have to explain this discrepancy. Why the authors studied the simulation only at the very small <math>d</math> only? The slope of the plots in Fig 1 is very steep when <math>d</math> is small. The reviewer can anticipate that there might be a big difference in the results if <math>d</math> slightly changes. The reviewer asks the authors to provide the similar results when <math>d</math> is ca. 2 mm where the temperature seems saturated. The importance of this contribution should be presented clearly. What can the authors predict using their approach? It may not be exciting if their method can only reproduce the experimental result.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	NA	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	NA	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**