



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_40246
Title of the Manuscript:	Calculation of Temporal Plasmas of XFEL Experiments with a Relativistic Collisional Radiative Average Atom Code
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors revised their manuscript. Part of the recommendations have been considered and included in the revised version. The authors demonstrated their computation capability of new code ATMED CR, which is based on average atom model. However, the correctness of their code is not demonstrated in the revised paper. Their responses of 1 and 2 cannot be accepted. I still recommend the authors add information to verify the validity of their results. 1. I don't try to discover new findings I just try to demonstrate that ATMED can compute the plasmas and that it can be one more code to benchmark results along with other collisional radiative models. 2. You all can trust the results because I have a very huge database of plasmas and for all chemical elements the properties are very accurate. One might believe that their code can compute the plasmas, but their code might not benchmark other theoretical results as their code is based on average atom model and Screened Hydrogenic Atomic Model. On the second point, only saying "You all can trust the results and for all chemical elements the properties are very accurate." is not enough. The readers hope to know that what accuracy their code can achieve, which is vital for their evaluation of the paper.	I agree the correctness of the code is not demonstrated inside the revised paper 1, so to amend this fact I've put in yellow one more section which explains in detail the hard process of the thesis and how the contrast with results within more than 380 references has been carried out carefully. Add this section as it is written or reduced the content if you want (optional). So it is optional to add it or not. I mean you can add this new section for being accepted now the responses 1 and 2, following your recommendation of adding information to verify the validity of results: 1. I don't try to discover new findings I just try to demonstrate that ATMED can compute the plasmas and that it can be one more code to benchmark results along with other collisional radiative models. It has been a participant of several workshops. 2. You all can trust the results because I have a very huge database of plasmas and for all chemical elements the properties are relatively accurate in comparison with results of scientific bibliography and within allowed margins and ranges. The benchmark of other theoretical or experimental results is included in the thesis book with a very huge sample of plasmas. This way I think the readers can know better what accuracy this code can achieve, finally getting a good evaluation of the paper.