



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_9239
Title of the Manuscript:	Synchronization of sources of radiation with the help of tunnelling
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The presentation of the research is not good. I attach a pdf-file with suggestions for improvements of the presentation. Also the scientific content is rather speculative and difficult to judge. I suggest that a revised version is sent to another referee. I do not feel sufficiently qualified on the topic of this manuscript to guarantee is soundness.	I express my gratitude to the reviewer for grammar corrections. I have improved text of article according them. I have improved the mistake in the heading of the section 5 (“phase” to “configuration”) what probably was the origin of the reviewer’s question. It seems to me that this section is interesting in the sense of the topology of this problem.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		