

Response Letter to the Reviewer's Comments

Reviewer 1's comments

Comment 1: In section Introduction line 2, “under the construction” should be “under construction”.

Response: The word ‘the’ has been removed.

Comment 2: In section 2 paragraph 2, The sentence “We used ... in the resonant cavity” needs a rewritten to avoid using active sentence for example “A simple pillbox cavity with an initial mesh size of 0.25 cm was used to investigate the field pattern in the resonant cavity”.

Response: The sentence has been changed to a passive form as suggested by the reviewer.

Comment 3: In section 2 paragraph 2, The sentence “..., the longitudinal index p has to be 2. Where as, m and n need some...” needs a statement mention of what is index mnp , this should be rewritten for example “..., the longitudinal index p of the TM_{mnp} cavity mode has to be 2. Where as, the index m and n need some...”.

Response: The phrase ‘ TM_{mnp} cavity mode’ has been added to the sentence to specify the index mnp .

Comment 4: In section 2 paragraph 3, “Study on...” should be “The study on...”.

Response: An article ‘the’ has been added in front of the word ‘study’.

Comment 5: In section 3 paragraph 3, “The resonant frequency had...” should be “The resonant frequency has ...”.

Response: The verb ‘had’ has been changed to ‘has’.

Comment 6: In paper should refer to all figure using “figure x” instead of “fig. x” as the guidelines from Journal of Physics: Conference Series. So please change all refer in text body from “fig. x” to “figure x”.

Response: All figures’ references have been changed from ‘fig. x’ to ‘figure x’.

Comment 7: In references section, reference [1] and [4] “et al” should be Italic style.

Response: The word ‘et al’ in reference [1] and [4] have been changed to Italic style.