



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31911
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Characterization of Multi-Stage EDFA System
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The author needs to compare his work with the previous works and should bring the consolidated results by comparison. The author has to improve the quality of the sentences. My following comments are properly addressed: Since the comparison is performed in a 16-channel WDM system, did you consider crosstalk between adjacent channels? Please review the literatures again. The pixel of Fig.2 is too low.	1-The comparison is actually stated throughout the text of section III . 2-The language level is enhanced in the revised version. 3-One of the main advantages of optical fiber is its immunity to crosstalk. Since the EDFA system is a type of fiber amplifiers, it presents no crosstalk amongst its amplified channels. This is demonstrated through the opening of the eye diagram in our simulation results. 4-We are exactly aware of what was done in the previously published literature. 5-The indicated figure is improved in the revised version.
Optional/General comments		