



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_37306
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Method Calculating The Sublevels Of Multi-Quantum Well Structures
Type of the 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>)

**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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors insist that they can explain the experimental data by electron interference model, which is quite simple. The potential energy on the layer is described by the multi-well structure, which one sees in Figure 3. If this potential is realized in the materials, Kronig-Penny model is reasonable for the MQW structure. I would like to know the reason why K-P model cannot explain the experimental data, but the simple model can do it. The authors should include theoretical discussions for the reason.</p> <p>The authors mentioned that the results predicted by K-P model are idealized cases. This statement is too simple. One section should be added for this discussion.</p> <p>In the introduction the authors should review theoretical studies to explain the experimental data of the MQW layer.</p> <p>Since there are no reviews in the manuscript, I wonder that this work might be the first attempt. Is it correct?</p>	<p>Thank you, Reviewer, for your comment. I have finished some of corrections in your opinion.</p> <p>Theoretically, our experimental results on MQW Structures could be explained using Kronig-Penney model but, in fact, could be not. So far, We do not yet find a certain reason for the explanation and will continue to consider the mystery.</p> <p>Some of our papers involving the manuscript have been published on some international journal ,such as Superlattice and Microstructures,2003,33,P.73-80, Phys. Scr. 2006,73,P.1-4, J.Phys.D. Applied Phys.2005,38,P.1989-1992, Physica E, 2006,33,P211-215,and Applied Surface Science, 2006,252,P.5868-5872. After reading these papers, you can referee that it is correct or is not.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>I found some errors in the manuscript.</p> <p>1) References 3),4) are duplicate.</p> <p>2) At the line 86 and 116, the unit is lacked for E_g.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		