



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_9686
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Cross Section for Different Fusion Reactions in Terms of Lattice Effects in Solid State Internal Conversion in Crystalline Palladium Environment
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 (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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - missing gaps between many of the words - unacceptable links (news, Wikipedia - [2], [3]) - incomplete links ([1], [4], [6]) - page 2, bottom paragraph (a): "More than 100 percent of deuteriums are immediately absorbed..." how it can be absorbed more deuterium than it has (more than 100 percent of total amount?!) - can you prove with some reference the acceptance of cold fusion (as claimed on page 1, 6th line from the bottom) - In Conclusion is written that "In previous experiments the complete reason for increasing cross section experimentally for these reactions are not explained..." From this one can understand that experimental cross-sections are available and the theoretical results should be compared with it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missing gaps are checked. - reference 2 and 3 are corrected - Incomplete references are completed now. - "More than 100 per cents", is just a phrase to show that more than exists sites in each palladium unit cell are possessed by deuterium. I correct the text and change the phrase I used before. - I missed to reference; I put the reference in page one 6th line from bottom. - The basic work has experimental data not this work I could not say what I really meant before. There are no experimental references that work on lattice effect in solid state internal conversion in these reactions for Palladium environment. One or two of them are worked before but not in term of LEISSIC.
	-	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stating references in the headline of the paragraph is very unusual - put the before every name (eg. the Bloch theorem, the Wannier function...) - there are several typing errors in fig 1 (Sievertz-law, surface temp) - page 2 paragraph 2 first row "modification of Peter Kalman" - page 2 paragraph 2 row 4 "article is divided into five..." - page 3 first row "deuteriums as sublattice" - page 5 second paragraph row 1 "in the [16]" - page 6 second paragraph – various size of letters in one sentence - page 6 third paragraph row 5 – "The sublattice particle is also described..." - equation 3 – pointer is close to the equation, not at the end of the line as anywhere else - page 6 fourth and last paragraph, page & first paragraph – eg. "The Coulomb wave function is[]". What [] does mean? - page 7 before equation 12 – missing space between the equation and „respectively“ - page 8 equation 18....split to two lines - page 9 6th row of first paragraph – "three kinds of host particles" - page 10, header of table 4 – missing end of the sentence (...probably cross-section) - page 11 – differences between maximum and minimum histograms are hard to understand and they should be better explained - page 11 header of table 6 – "The two dimensional seven maximums modes of microscopic cross section..." "The maximum cross sections" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I correct grammatical and typing mistakes as well as I can. - Page 6 fourth and last paragraph, page & first paragraph – e.g.: I wanted to mention a number of references but I forgot. - I plot the figures at first but some of the cross section overlap to each other so they couldn't be recognize. I divided them into two groups 7 maximums cross section and five minimum cross sections in the separate figures.
---------------------------------------	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - page 15 last row – “4He. By” instead of “4He .By” 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the topic is still a bit controversial, so a perfect references are absolutely essential to support the research - as figures 1 – 4 are stated without any reference, one should assume they were prepared by the authors...is this true? (At least fig 3 can be found on the web) - figures 5-13 have units of x-axis in MeV, although the numbers are never higher than 0.03. keV might be more convenient?! - list of typesetting errors stated above is definitely not complete...please do a careful proof reading 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - references are corrected - References of figs 1 , 3 and 4 are clear now . I saw a shape from pycnoduterium in some article then I made a shape that I use here. - About fig 5- 13: I wrote it wrong. I had to right keV. I just wrote it wrong under the axis. - I read it again to correct typing.