



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_PSIJ_8589
Title of the Manuscript:	Cathode Plasma Radiation in a Repetitive Pulsed Diffuse Discharge in an Inhomogeneous Electric Field
Type of the Article	Short 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the symbols not defined in this report 2. Can give more explanation if increase or decrease the applying voltage in this experimental 3. What about the temperature (used to apply the results), can affect the results if increase or decrease. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All four symbols used in the paper are defined in the text (see line 129 and below). 2. Explanations are given in the text of the paper (see line 49 and below). 3. All experiments were performed at room temperature of the gas (~20°C). Increase of the gas temperature in the working area (e.g., when working in a pulse-periodic mode) is equivalent to decrease of the gas pressure and promotes the discharge burning to a greater extent.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. May can submit more declaration about the nature of the phenomenon (talking in this work) in the methodology before going to the results and discussion parts. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explanations are given in the text (see line 62 and below).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The vertical surface support the results comparing with the lateral surface?, please write some explanation about this to cover the work from all the sides 2. the references used not enough to support the results 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the parts of the lateral surface provide this result regardless of their orientation. Explanations are given in the text of the paper (see line 78 and below). 2. The number of references in increased.