



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9685
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Cross Section for Different Fusion Reactions in Terms of Lattice Effects in Solid State Internal Conversion for Different metallic Crystalline Environments</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

**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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper is interesting and regards an important task in LERN studies.</p> <p>I suggest essentially two points: 1) a revision of the Introduction, it is too long and some information are well-known and not scientifically-sound. I suggest a strong reduction; 2) a deep reference revision: in my draft there are a lot of refs in red without any information (two main refs are dated 1926 and 1956, too late!!!). Please, fill each ref because in this way the paper cannot be published. Further, ref 9, wikipedia, is not allowed in a scientific paper. Please, review the key-words, they are not explanatory.</p> <p>Finally, also the session 2, "Internal Conversion (IC) and Solid State Internal Conversion (SSIC)", should be reduced.</p>	<p>Thanks for your recommendation. I really try to reduce introduction as long as it's possible. The references were only a draft and the wrong file was sent. I tried to change some of the old references. But not all of them, because some of them belong to main article and the authors of those article use those measurement in the old ones.</p> <p>I try to reduce session 2, too. The key words are explained, now.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Actually, in my opinion there are some grammar problems so the lecture is quite difficult in some points. I suggest a deep English revision.</p>	<p>Grammar problems are solved.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This is an interesting paper deserving publication after the major revision.</p>	