

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Physical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2982
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ERROR IN DETERMINING THE TEMPERATURE OF PLASMA ELECTRONS
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript focus on valuable insights into the complexities of measuring plasma electron temperatures. 2. It addressing key sources of error that have historically hindered accurate assessments. 3. This idea not only advances fundamental plasma physics but also has practical implications for applications in fusion energy research, astrophysics, and materials science, ultimately contributing to the development of more effective experimental methods and technologies in the field. <p>Like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough exploration of the challenges in measuring plasma electron temperatures. 2. It highlights important issues that can affect data accuracy, which is crucial for advancing research in plasma physics. 3. By addressing both theoretical and practical aspects, it provides a solid foundation for future studies. 4. This focus on improving measurement techniques can lead to significant advancements in various applications, making it a valuable contribution to the scientific community. <p>Dislike:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript may lack depth in certain areas, such as potential solutions to the identified challenges. 2. It doesn't sufficiently explore alternative diagnostic methods or offer practical recommendations for overcoming measurement errors, it could limit its utility for researchers seeking to improve their methodologies. Additionally, if the writing is overly technical without clear explanations. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title "The Error in Determining the Temperature of Plasma Electrons" is quite clear and indicates a focus on the challenges associated with measuring electron temperature in plasmas.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract conveys essential information, by adding below elements would make it more informative and engaging for readers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A brief statement about the main goal of the study could clarify its significance. 2. A short mention of how the analysis was conducted would provide context. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically suitable, addressing a critical issue in the measurement of plasma electron temperatures. It systematically analyzes the errors associated with radiometric diagnostic methods, providing a clear connection between instrument characteristics and measurement accuracy. The quantitative assessment of these errors is particularly valuable, as it allows for a better understanding of the implications for real-world applications, such as spacecraft descent trajectories. Overall, the attention to detail and the focus on empirical analysis suggest a strong foundation in scientific principles, contributing to the reliability of its conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript cover a range of relevant topics, including plasma diagnostics, radiometric techniques, and atmospheric re-entry, which supports the study's context. However, the majority of the sources appear to be somewhat dated, with some published over a decade ago. To ensure that the manuscript reflects the most current research and advancements in the field, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies and reviews.</p> <p>References to Consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recent Publications in Journals: Check journals like <i>Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion</i>, <i>Journal of Applied Physics</i>, or <i>IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science</i> for relevant articles from the past few years. Conference Proceedings: Look for recent conference papers from aerospace or plasma physics conferences that may discuss diagnostic methods or findings related to spacecraft descent. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article generally appear to be suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas that could be improved for clarity and readability. Here are some specific observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Technical Terminology: The manuscript uses appropriate technical terminology relevant to plasma physics and radiometric diagnostics, which is essential for a scholarly audience. Clarity and Precision: Some sentences could be rephrased for greater clarity. For example, complex sentences may benefit from simplification or breaking them into shorter sentences to improve comprehension. Grammar and Syntax: There are a few instances of awkward phrasing or grammatical errors that could be refined. Proofreading for grammatical accuracy and fluidity would enhance the overall quality. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Could be consider after revision.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Kumar
Department, University & Country	Bharati Vidyapeeth's College of Engineering, GGSIP University, India