



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_20646
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential of the Penning Ionization Gauge (PIG) Ion Source in attaining High Energy Rydberg States
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The topic addressed is interesting, however, the Figures are not professional and motivations are really unclear. Besides, it is not evident where are real novelties in comparison to the standard theory.</p> <p>I would like to ask authors to rewrite carefully their paper, to address properly the problem, comparing their results with standard findings if any.</p> <p>I look forward to read the revised version.</p>	<p>The author addressed the issue by adding text that supports the novelty and motivation.</p> <p>The author also compared the findings against a standard commercial source and thus explained the novelty of the study, in lines, 232 to 234</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		