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| **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)* |
| **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.** | **The introduction is not well addressed, owing to without any preamble, it goes straight out to the subjects which shall be discussed by sub-chapters.****From my standpoint, the manuscript target are not so clear. What is the manuscript purpose, to show results of several types of discharge structures? Why these subjects are not discussing briefly for the readers at the beginning, throughout the introduction section together with the manuscript aim?** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, it is.** |  |
| **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.** | **The abstract’s ideas are clear, but it seems to me that there are too much additional information between parenthesis, which makes that readers lost the track of the content that the manuscript deals with.****Even though, the ideas are stated in a straightforward manner, the excessive information in parenthesis hurdles the understanding.** |  |
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| **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.** | **Each sub-chapter shows and describes the experimental setup, its results as well as the physical phenomena´s cause –effect. The sub-chapters, can be reproduced easily by other researchers for being compared the results and discussions here stated.****As a digest, the discharge structures have been explained which is valuable, in order to grasp the fundamentals of each and every of the structure.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **All the references are out of date, so it is suggested to author(s) to consult the updated ones.** |  |
| Minor REVISION comments**Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language is straight and clear for scientific communication. |  |
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