



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_31669
Title of the Manuscript:	Computer Modeling of Properties of Superparticles with the Help of Experimental Data Run I at the LHC
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	<p>1. In the abstract: The last sentence saying “These results are relevant...” must be written at the end of the conclusion, saying “These results can be relevant...,” or just eliminated it.</p> <p>1. Sentence on line 23 saying “supersymmetric was tested by a...” must be changed by “supersymmetric can give an explanation to the following experiments which indicate physics beyond SN: “</p> <p>3. lines 24, 25 and 26 require references.</p> <p>4. Explain if the M_0 appearing in the Lagrangia is the same m_0 appearing in Figures 1,2,3,4 and table 1.</p> <p>5. Explain the meaning of $\tan\beta$ appearing in table 1.</p> <p>6. Table 2 looks like that it indicates that scenarios I an II have the lightest Higg masses, contrary to lines 114 and 115 are saying.</p> <p>7. Units on tables 5 and 6 are not clear and different. Use the same units in both tables.</p>	<p>1. In the abstract I changed the last sentence: “These results give concrete predictions for further SUSY searches at the LHC”.</p> <p>2. The phrase in line 23 “can give an explanation to the following experiments which indicate physics beyond SM” is used.</p> <p>3. lines 24, 25, 26 became with references.</p> <p>4. M_a in lagrangian are complex gaugino masses, but m_0 is common scalar mass parameter of CMSSM model, that is explained in the paper.</p> <p>5. “the ratio of vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of the two Higgs boson doublets (at the electroweak scale), which is denoted by $\tan\beta$”, from paper.</p> <p>6. From paper: “From Table 2 it can be seen, that masses of lightest Higgs boson of third and fourth scenarios are in experimental mass range of measured SM-like Higgs boson, while the other masses of CMSSM model Higgs bosons (CP-even H_0, CP-odd A and charged H^\pm) are essentially larger”.</p> <p>7. Units over Table 5 and 6 are presented in generally accepted units: femtobarns (fb) and nanobarns (nb). They differ by three orders of magnitude and can't be the same.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would be good point out in conclusion that ...so far, no clear evident has been found in LHC of SUSY particles, but one expects to find them at higher energies.	The conclusion is changed in accordance with this notion.