



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The research is really interesting. But this manuscript needs minor revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction could include more references.</li> <li>• Practical significance of the results should be better described.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are a lot of references in the introduction! Besides, no much reference in this subject (automatic counting, CR-39 and tracks) as explained before!</li> <li>- Authors think the result and discussion is more than enough, because in the methods section they explained most of the things related to the results. If the reviewer believes that the moving of some sentences in methods section to the discussion section will improve it, they can do it!</li> </ul>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		