



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRRI_3906
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of the optimum design and extraction optics for a glow discharge Ion source

**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**

**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><b>Figure 2: Please check the labelling of the X,Y axes in figure 2. The figure caption does not describe the figure accurately.</b></p> <p><b>Figure 3: units PN2 should be mbar</b></p> <p><b>Units should be given in all figures from 1-5. Also, please check the labelling in all figures, they are non-readable.</b></p> <p><b>Figure 8d : please define V plasma=-2 kV</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Figure 6 shows extraction ion beam versus distance anode- extraction electrode. A secondary peak appear at 6 mm. Can you comment on that?</b></p>	<p>We did the required corrections for Fig. 2</p> <p>We put the units of pressure in mbar</p> <p>We did all the required corrections</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The figures can be linked together the paper without loss of clarity, e.g. figure 2 with figure 3	We did all the required coorections
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Figure captions 2-3: <b>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</b>  <b>I recommend to use similar definitions in experiments as in simulation</b>	We did all the required coorections