

Response to Reviewers

**Dear Prof. Editor of the special issue on
The 4th International Electronic Conference on Applied Sciences**

Thank you very much indeed for your email, dated 22nd Sep. 2023, concerning the reviewers comments on the manuscript titled "**Title:** Irradiated Hazelnut (*Corylus avellana*): Identification and Dose Assessment Using EPR", by Maghraby, A. et al., [Ref. sciforum-077851].

All suggestions and required corrections are considered carefully. Also the journal format was followed.

Please find attached the revised manuscript; you find here detailed response to the editor comments.

Thank you again, with best regards.

Maghraby, A.

There are several points that should be considered by the authors:

Comment#	Reviewer (1)	Response
1	Please avoid using abbreviations in the title and keywords	Done
2	The Abstract does not follow the general structure recommended. I suggest rewriting the abstract by structuring it as: Background, Objectives (state briefly the novelty of the study), a brief statement for Methods, major results, a brief conclusion, and the significance of your research.	Done
3	The novelty of your work is not clear. The necessity of doing research is not mentioned. The gap in research should be described clearly.	Added to the introduction
4	Please do not use abbreviations in the Figure captions.	Done
5	- The resolution of the Figure 2 is not sufficient.	Done
6	Before the "Results and Discussion", a section subtitled "statistical analysis" is required in order to explain the data analysis methods or software.	A sentence before "results and discussion" was added to clarify how statistical uncertainties were estimated.
7	- The discussion part is poor. The findings need more discussion with more supporting references.	Results are divided into five subsections, each one has its own findings, and all supports the process of proper identification of the irradiated hazelnut and proper dose estimation. The nature of the topic doesn't allow

		Comparison with published data in most cases, simply because there is a little of published data in this topic.
8	- Please add some suggestions for future trends at the end of "Conclusion"..	Done
9	- Manuscript must be revised grammatically by a native Englishman	Revised as possible

Ahmed