Although the problems being addressed are potentially of interest to our readership, your manuscript does not meet the required quality standards to be considered for publication.  
  
The research results reported are too premature for publication. More work is needed to substantiate the conclusions in your manuscript.  
  
  
After reviewing the revised version after the initial review and the reviewer's comments and responses, it is determined that the authors have explained the content of the two comments by Reviewer 1,  
but that the specific responses have not been made in an appropriate manner. In addition, since the editor in charge of the project was to change, the editor decided to have another reviewer author, who is an expert in the field concerned, check the revisions.  
While we recognize that this is an important piece of research, we have determined that it is now difficult to continue the peer review process without a number of revisions and additional evaluation.  
  
We must even consider rejecting content that we believe will not be evaluated to JNM journal standards without such significant revisions and additional calculations.  
For this reason, authors are encouraged to make additional evaluation calculations as much as possible as a mandatory requirement for some content, as several reviewers have pointed out.  
If necessary, please consider that requests for extensions of the submission deadline for reworked versions can be made on the JNM system as progress is made.  
Please be sure to take the appropriate action.  
In your response, please be sure to do so in a format that clearly indicates each and every correction you have made.  
  
In the overall major issue, what was done in the main study that is mostly a summary?  
We hardly know. This Please understand that the content of this submitted paper is not a review commentary, and that it is not appropriate to include this type of content; if this is the only content, we will usually have to reject the paper for that reason.  
This is because there is no indication of specific research progress (there is no quantitative expression at all) or novelty content at all, and we do not know.  
  
Otherwise, please check the JNM journal guidelines carefully and make corrections.  
The format of the cited references in the text is also different.  
The format of the references in the text is also different, and in some places, MPa units are not properly described.  
Please use the same units for pressure.  
Figure X in the text and figure captions should be bolded as Fig. X.  
Please correct the format of all references.  
  
In addition, there are many simple assignments, such as  
1. please also indicate the threshold energy and references needed to repel the atoms that form the basis of the calculation.  
2. Please be sure to provide numerical values and citations for the activation energies and diffusion coefficients of the underlying interstitial atoms and atomic vacancies that you are evaluating in Figure 4.  
3. also, it is difficult to understand Fig. 5 without giving detailed explanations, since they will always change as the crystal structure changes. Please make sure that the reader can understand.  
4. is the name of each of the physical quantities on the vertical axis in Figure 6 correct? Be sure to include appropriate citations and supplements.  
5. Please make sure to give the equations for the physical quantities on the vertical axis so that the reader can correctly understand Figure 8.  
6. be sure to give the units and physical quantities in Figure 9. In particular, the physical quantity on the vertical axis of c is unclear.  
7. The last part of the discussion is very unclear, and it is unclear what you want to say in this paper. it is clear that the NRT model is already not the standard model in the nuclear materials field, so could you please improve the accuracy of the discussion?  
  
  
The overall logical structure of the paper is presented, but the contents are not clear one by one (insufficient).  
If this situation continues, the paper may be rejected or transfer to another journal for peer review.  
Please improve as much as possible.