SDI Review Form 1.6

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 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Figure 2: Please check the labelling of the X,Y axes in figure 2. The figure caption does not describe the figure accurately.** **Figure 3: units PN2 should be mbar** **Units should be given in all figures from 1-5. Also, please check the labelling in all figures, they are non-readable.** **Figure 8d : please define V plasma=-2 kV** **It is not clear how the SIMION simulations follow the experimental findings; the authors report a maximum ion beam at a distance of 6 mm while the simulation show an optimum at 3 mm. Also different extraction voltages are used in the simulations compared to experiments. Please comment on these differences.** **Figure 6 shows extraction ion beam versus distance anode- extraction electrode. A secondary peak appear at 6 mm. Can you comment on that?**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The figures can be linked together the paper without loss of clarity, e.g. figure 2 with figure 3	
Optional/General comments	Figure captions 2-3: **The distance between the cathode and anode is more relevant than the distance between the cathode and the extraction electrode. I would interchange figure 4 with figure 5** **I recommend to use similar definitions in experiments as in simulation**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer