



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_32822
Title of the Manuscript:	Exact Calculation of the Internal Energy of the Ideal Gas in Statistical Mechanics
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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	<p>Line 2-3: The word “previously” used in the abstract shows that this write-up is a follow up from the earlier one, so the title should reflect this.</p> <p>Line 6-7: The abstract is not clear and does not capture the write-up appropriately; it must be reconstructed to standard.</p> <p>Line 13-32: More explanations and references are needed with respect to the statistical mechanics.</p> <p>Line 94-98: Explanation is not clear, especially in trying to say that equation 13 must look like equation 16</p> <p>Line 120: The partial derivative $(\partial 1/\partial v)_u$ is wrong as it is equal zero.</p>	<p>I meant that previously all other scientists supposed that the volume is a constant.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Done. Four references added.</p> <p>I made it clearer.</p> <p>I do not deny that it is zero, and write about that explicitly.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paragraphing in lines 29, 46, 61, 85, 118, 123, 128, 148, 161, 168 and 175 are not necessary.</p> <p>Line 183-197: The references are poorly written and not up to standard</p>	<p>I fixed it.</p> <p>I wrote the references according to the Guide for Authors given on the site of the journal. On the Template there are the same rules of formatting references. What means poorly written?</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should consider and amend all the comments above before publishing.	