



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_18792
Title of the Manuscript:	An Experiment to Measure the Speed of Alternating Electricity
Type of the Article	Original 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. the work is to measure the speed of alternating electricity with 3 MHz 8 frequency region and under the circuit parameters, finally, the speed of alternating electric field can be 209 times more than the speed of light. It's a very interesting issue. 2. The 2nd line before equation (1), "... for a simple circuit, ..." should be given more detail description? 3. The set up for the experimental shown in Figure 1 is too rough to understand. This is suggested to be explained more deeply. 4. The input impedance of the oscilloscope is 1M_ohm, does any reason for the specific value? 	<p>Thanks for the reviewer's kind comment.</p> <p>* The 2nd line before equation (1), "... for a simple circuit, ..."</p> <p>We have made changes and given a detail description.</p> <p>* The set up for the experimental shown in Figure 1 is too rough to understand. Following your suggestion, I have added more explanation.</p> <p>* The input impedance of the oscilloscope is 1M_ohm, Following your suggestion, I have added an explanation.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. all of the cited equations are suggested marked with the references number. 2. No conclusions are shown in the work?? 3. Thus, not contributions are expressed at current stage. 	<p>* Following your suggestion, the cited equations are marked with the references number.</p> <p>* The conclusions are shown in the end of the paper.</p> <p>We have improved the discussion part and the preliminary conclusion as highlighted in yellow colour.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		