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 13th Oct. 2023, concerning the reviewers comments on the manuscript titled "**Title:** Can Ammonium Tartrate Replace alanine in EPR Radiation Dosimetry?", by Maghraby, A. et al., [Ref. sciforum-077836].

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	My main criticism is that the authors cite several papers on the same topic (use of ammonium tartrate as dosimeter in EPR measurements) but they never make it clear what their present work has to add to this literature or in what respect their present work is different from previous papers	Yes there are several papers on ammonium tartrate dosimeters and all of them are not replicate to each other, current work adds the following: - Answers the title question if ammonium tartrate can replace alanine. - Study the dosimetry for different radiation energy (Cs-137). - Study larger radiation doses ranges. - Calculated precession and combined uncertainty for numerous radiation doses. - Confirmed the presence of the second radical.
2	ref-16 does not make the assignment; in ref-16 the assignment is quoted as originating from Brustolon et al (1996) Res Chem Intermed 22, 359;	This is true, and the reference is changed.
3	the structure that the present authors draw is not a radical; the radical dot is missing.	Yes, Radical dot added, Done.
4	In ref-17 it is reported that the Amm-tartrate EPR signal saturates above a microwave power of 0.5 mW. The authors of that paper then decide to use a slightly higher (and therefore slightly saturating)	This true, the right value is 0.6315 mW (or 631.5uW), Corrected.

	power of 1.6 mW for data collection presumably to get a better signal-to-noise ratio. The authors of the present work use an even higher power of 6.3 mW, What is the argumentation to use this power?	
5	The quality of the English is problematic, e.g.,: (a) change of time from present to past to present in a single sentence; (b) omission of the verb in some sentences; (c) non-correspondence of singular-plural in subject-verb combinations; (d) wrong usage of certain words, e.g., 'clearance' instead of 'cleanliness', 'vanishing' instead of 'eliminating'.	Language revised as possible, if there any mistakes please inform me.

Ahmed