



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_22652
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPING A FAST AFFORDABLE AUTOMATIC COUNTING SYSTEM OF CR-39 SOLID STATE NUCLEAR TRACK DETECTORS
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The abstract should reflect your result not only general expressions. 2- No address standards and other guidance recently published or in course of development in order to achieve harmonization of practices and procedures for Radon monitoring. Suggest that more relevant reference will be necessary for this study. 3- More discussion should be done to helpful for building the study framework. 4- The conclusion should contain the major results from the study not general information. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Done 2. This is the novelty of this study; very few people developed such system which in radon monitoring they still use the manual counting until this moment! Authors believe the references that already included in this manuscript were enough since there are no recently studies talking about an automatic system. 3. Authors think the result and discussion is more than enough, because in the method's section they already explained most of the things related to the results. If the reviewer believes that the moving of some sentences in method's section to the discussion section will improve it, they can do it! 4. Authors added some things. Please check.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Check reference 15 and equation(1) as well 2- The construction of material and methods would be clearer. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Done 2. More than this!!!!!! Authors believe that the more clearer or addition to this section will give more details of the system and help the others to build a similar one. If the reviewer has a look at the references, he can find that NO one has mentioned any specific details on how their system works! I think he has to look at the previous articles about the methods of developing such system. Because explaining more will give the ability for the others to build this system commercially way and authors will lose the copyright of it!!!)



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The construction of material and methods would be clearer	More than this!!!!!! Authors believe that the more clearer or addition to this section will give more details of the system and help the others to build a similar one. If the reviewer has a look at the references, he can find that NO one has mentioned any specific details on how their system works! I think he has to look at the previous articles about the methods of developing such system. Because explaining more will give the ability for the others to build this system commercially way and authors will lose the copyright of it!!!)
---	---	---