SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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 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)

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	The authors present their computational capability of a collisional radiative model to investigate the temporal evolution of populations in plasmas produced in the interaction with XFEL. However, such computational capability has been demonstrated in their published papers listed in the references of this manuscript. From this point, this manuscript lacks of novelty according to the this journal's peer review policy. If the authors hope to revise their manuscript, major improvements should be made to meet the peer review policy. Following aspects, among other better ideas, should be considered and included in this manuscript. 1. For neon and aluminium, the authors present more novel studies to show that they meet the peer review policy. There might be many new findings which have not reported on this topic. 2. Make comparison with other theoretical results including those of average atom model and more accurate ones using detailed level accounting and unresolved transition array to demonstrate the validity of their model. There are many papers available in the literature. **3.** It is not necessary to give such detailed tables for the rates obtained by screened Hydrogenic Atomic Model. Even the rates obtained by using more accurate methods are not necessarily appended as they are not the main point.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Jiaolong Zeng***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Physics, College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410073, Hunan, PR China***