

REVIEWS ON THE MANUSCRIPT [3]

Reviewer 1:

The manuscript is adequately scoped and well written to be recommended for publication, although I can make a general encouragement that the author should aim higher than he believes he can reach.

Reviewer 2:

This paper is quite well written although I would possibly like to see the language straightened up a bit. As an example I take:

"Ask every person you meet and he/she will definitely agree, that all the bodies emit energy. However only a few will add that some part of energy can not be seen by human eye."

This is maybe not the style you would expect in a scientific paper. Sentences like these are irrelevant and I suggest that the author check out the paper for similar sentences.

However, this is not a very important point, just some advice, and I would be willing to recommend the paper as it is.

Editorial request:

"Wolfram": Tungsten?

Images: Are all images in the manuscript of own work?

The Figure 4, for example, appears to be matching this image:

http://www.canadaconnects.ca/_quantumphysics/photos/planckslaw.jpg. Please reference rigorously any images that are not of own work.

Units: Please use a blank spacing between a numerical value and its unit (5600 K not 5600K).

Graphs: Consider improving the resolution (for example, for Figure 1) which is not so far sufficient.

Figure 3: Consider improving the notations at the y-axes. "2e+12" is not a fully appropriate representation.

This request was focused on the technical side of the manuscript and abstained from judging its physical essence.

Response of the author:

I gratefully appreciate your thorough review of my manuscript. Unfortunately, I was not enough experienced to check the style, so thank you for pointing out this issue. I agree to all suggestions, especially now when I haven't had my text in mind for some time. I have corrected also stylistic and visual drawbacks and revised the whole text once more.