



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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"> In abstract, "Cadmium Sulphide thin-film"? did you deposite?; "thickness of 0.143 nm" is incredible. The micrograph of the sample should be provided. In Fig. 2 and 3, the scale range of the lateral axis should be adjusted to fully show plots. In Fig. 4, the size of letter and number should be enough large and uniform with other figures.. In Fig. 3, the selected linear part of the plot is too short, so that bandgap should be re-calculated. The grammar and spelling errors widely exist and should be carefully corrected. Such as: line 52, "dissloved" should be "dispersed"; Redundent space between two words;..... The method and equipment of the characterization should be given. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In abstract, "Cadmium Sulphide thin-film"? did you deposite?; "thickness of 0.143 nm" is incredible. Response: The thickness reported in the abstract is that of PbTe, thus the statement there has been reframed as reported in line 7. In Fig. 2 and 3, the scale range of the lateral axis should be adjusted to fully show plots. In Fig. 4, the size of letter and number should be enough large and uniform with other figures. Response: The font of the figures has been adjusted as line 68 and 81. In Fig. 3, the selected linear part of the plot is too short, so that bandgap should be re-calculated. Response: The straight line has been redrawn to pass through more points and a new band gap energy of 0.22eV was obtained as shown in line 75. The grammar and spelling errors widely exist and should be carefully corrected. Such as: line 52, "dissloved" should be "dispersed"; Redundent space between two words;..... Response: The recommendations have been attended to. However, the redundant space between two or more words is due to different version of office used as I cannot detect any. The method and equipment of the characterization should be given. Response: Solar Simulator 4200-SCS was used for the characterization under the irradiance of 1.5 AM (1000Wm⁻²) as reported in line 78-79.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	