



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_46248
Title of the Manuscript:	Chirped Gaussian Pulse excitation of a harmonic oscillator
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		
Minor REVISION comments	In introduction section, the authors may give more explanation for the model of a laser pulsed- driven- single quantised. In place of summary they may include conclusion and future work and also some more reference papers.	We thank the referees for their comments. In the revised version: 1) We have corrected the typographical errors mentioned in the report. Also, consistent reference to the figures is done throughout the paper. 2) We have added a third paragraph referring to additional physical realization of the single mode quantized HO with new references [5,6]. 3) In the last section, 5, we have added the last paragraph about possible future extension of the present model, with addition of two references [8,9].
Optional/General comments	The paper content was good. Authors clearly explained about single chirped Gaussian laser pulse model and also examined analytically and computationally.	

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