



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14876
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Plasma Parameters in Co- Sputtering Discharge
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General- A thorough English language and grammar check with necessary corrections in many places of the entire text is required for the English written. Proper restructuring of the sentences must be done where required. Proper maintenance of case (upper & lower) in the sentences must be done. There must be uniformity in the written 'tense' chosen in the text. Help from an expert is recommended. Specific- In fig. 1, indicate the Langmuir probe position. The experimental technique part should be re-written completely. Moreover, the grammar needs correction. In results and discussion section, the sentence "This may be.....the ions" is speculative which does not make proper sense. Already, much have been known in this regard. In table 1, n_e variation at 6 cm from that of 4 cm and 8 cm should be explained with justification in the text. If the authors think that their results give a new	We did all the correction and note it was mentioned on your comments. Thank you a lot for your suggestion. We do the Most of the explanations on your point you mention it in the review -comment.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	direction then it must be properly justified. The paragraph starting as “It is well known....” indeed refers to proven results. The sections from (3-3 to 3-6) does not contribute in any way to useful findings to the plasma physics community. Most of the explanations are trivial in nature. Needs serious re-structuring if included in the text. In references section, no uniformity is maintained.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should try to highlight the importance of their work in a more subtle way – may be from industrial application point of view for co-sputtering plasma.	