SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	
	Asian Journal of Physical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPS_30695
Title of the Manuscript:	THE COHESIVE ENERGY CALCULATIONS OF SOME BCC (Li, Cr, Fe, Mo) LATTICES USING
	DENSITY FUNCTIONAL THEORY
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any) Authors very response to final evaluator's comments 3. Authors dight compare their equilibrium values for lattice constants with experimental and other ones. They must do that. 3. Authors used experimental values of lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constants); however, they may do as evaluator suggested in other future work. 4 OK 5. It seems to me the authors seem don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations			
and other ones. They must do that. 4 OK about Fe, however it must be clear marked in the test. 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. ************************************		Authors' response to final evaluator's comments	
 4 OK about Fe, however it must be clear marked in the test. 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 6. This result demonstrates that the paper can not be published. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying converges of calculations. Authors see that what and can be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have calculated that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	3. Authors didn't compare their equilibrium values for lattice constants with experimental	3. Authors used experimental values of lattice constant which is certainly inexpensive (usually	
 4 OK about Fe, however it must be clear marked in the test. 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 5. If the 5 and 6 items will not be revised the paper can not be published. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	and other ones. They must do that.	about 1% difference from equilibrium lattice constants); however, they may do as evaluator	
 4 OK about Fe, however it must be clear marked in the test. 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 5. If the 5 and 6 items will not be revised the paper can not be published. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 		suggested in other future work.	
 4. OK 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calculations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 5. Authors see that there is no trouble as long as total energy does not increase towards the end of iterations, but converges. Authors can say here that the converged values for total energy of crystals or bulk structures are decreased or less than those of their corresponding atoms as shown clearly in table 1 of the revised manuscript. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	4 OK about Fe, however it must be clear marked in the test.		
 5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 5. Authors see that there is no trouble as long as total energy does not increase towards the end of iterations, but converges. Authors can say here that the converged values for total energy of crystals or bulk structures are decreased or less than those of their corresponding atoms as shown clearly in table 1 of the revised manuscript. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 		4. OK	
 calmly demonstrate increasing of the total energy of crystals at increase in number of iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 5. Authors see that there is no trouble as long as total energy does not increase towards the end of iterations, but converges. Authors can say here that the converged values for total energy of crystals or bulk structures are decreased or less than those of their corresponding atoms as shown clearly in table 1 of the revised manuscript. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	5. It seems to me the authors even don't understand the main trouble of their paper. They		
 iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible. 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. ************************************		5. Authors see that there is no trouble as long as total energy does not increase towards the	
 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy converges at least and can be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 			
 6. This result demonstrates that the authors made something PRINCIPAL wrong in calculations. No one code can provide such results. 5. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy converges at least and can be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	iterations instead of its decrease. This is physically impossible.		
 calculations. No one code can provide such results. ************************************	6 This result demonstrates that the authors made compthing DDINCIDAL wrong in		
 6. If there was error in calculations, FHI-aims codes would point it out clearly or calculations would stop running, and you wouldn't find the line " Have a nice day" signifying convergence of calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy converges at least and can be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self-consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	alonis as shown cleany in lable 1 of the revised manuscript.	
************************************	calculations. No one code can provide such results.	C. If there was arrest in calculations. FULL sime as des would point it out clearly an acloudations	
If the 5 and 6 items will not be revised the paper can not be published. If the 5 and 6 items will not be revised the paper can not be published. Calculations. Authors see that what is important is that total energy converges at least and can be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self- consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the	******		
be clearly seen as shown in the graphs; and total energy corrected for atom and bulk structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self- consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the			
structures of all the metals are used to calculate the cohesive energies. Also, authors have claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self- consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the	If the 5 and 6 items will not be revised the paper can not be published.		
claimed that the small changes observed in total energy may have come from the code's self- consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the			
consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the			
expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the			
		consistency field (S.C.F.) settings for accuracy in iterations. Finally, authors see that what they	
neighbourhood of experimentally found values and results from others.		expected from their investigation, that is, cohesive energy values were calculated in the	
		neighbourhood of experimentally found values and results from others.	

