



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_48981
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Characterization of PbTe Thin-film through Solvo Thermal Method
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested to compare the present work with the existing works. It would be better if the authors could incorporate a quantitative analysis showing the novelty or betterment of the present work. Fig 1 could be drawn in a better way. It is not symmetric everywhere. Fig 2 i not framed properly. Elaborate 'Materials and method' section. There are so many experimental works available in the website. Fig 4 is not readable. Conclusion is too generic and short. Could be placed in a better way. All the measuring instruments specification should be mentioned in the text. 	<p>"Fig 2 i not framed properly" Response: Figure 2 has been properly captured in line 68.</p> <p>"Fig 4 is not readable" Response: The font has been increased to 14 as shown in line 81.</p> <p>"All the measuring instruments specification should be mentioned in the text" Response: Solar Simulator 4200-SCS was used for the I-V characterization as mentioned in line 78. This was done in Sheda Science and Technology Complex (SHESTCO), Abuja Nigeria.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Some latest works should be there in the reference section.	
Optional/General comments	Lack of knowledge. Lack of expertise. It is suggested to rewrite the manuscript for possible publication.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	