



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_40019_A
Title of the Manuscript:	Fe K α lines of MCG-6-30-15: Emission from thin-torus particles around a Kerr black hole
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<p>Substitute all "in which" (6 times) appearing in equations 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2 and 3.3 by "where".</p> <p>In Page 3 change Figure 1 to Fig. 1 or write Figure instead of Fig. in the other cases.</p> <p>In page 5 change "without no loss" to "without loss"</p> <p>The figures have no good resolution. I recommend to expand them.</p> <p>I forgot to mention that the title of section 5</p>	<p>Thanks! All the places are updated.</p> <p>Thanks! All "Fig." are replaced by "Figure".</p> <p>Great appreciation! It is updated.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the comment! The seemingly "not good" data-fit resolution is in fact better than the instrument resolution of observations. Because the paper focuses on data-fit modelling, it meets the needs of the study with such a simulation resolution. Specifically, the explanation appears in two places as follows:</p> <p>(1) The first paragraph in Section 4 (highlighted in black):</p> <p>For the data-fit modeling, because the maximal energy resolution in the observation of MCG-6-30-15 [7] is seven sampled points in each spectrum unit 1 keV, corresponding to the sampling step of 0.143 keV, we first try 0.05 and 0.1 keV as the numerical step, respectively, which are higher than the measurement resolution. The obtained profiles are superimposed upon each other in the two cases, except more peaks to be produced in the former case. We thus select 0.1 keV.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be Conclusion or Discussion, but not the two words	<p>(2) The second paragraph in Section 4.3 (highlighted in black):</p> <p>As mentioned above, the sampling step of the observation was 0.143 keV. We thus rebin the numerical step as $6.35/50 \text{ keV} = 0.127 \text{ keV}$, which is close to but a little higher than the instrumental resolution for realistic data-fit simulations. Calculations with the rebinned step are shown in Figure 4.</p> <p>Thanks! It is updated as "Conclusion".</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is a very good one.	Thank you so much for the encouragement!