



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_23370
Title of the Manuscript:	THE STUDY OF SILVER NANOPARTICLES IN BASIS OF SLATER FUNCTIONS
Type of the Article	Review papers

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The sentence in the line 11 in Abstract "Calculations were carried out the authors' own computer program." Is not suitable there. It should be removed and the detailed information may be given in the main text. 2) In line 19, "..... due to their properties." Which properties? It should be indicated. The following lines up to line 22, there are related information. They can combined. 3) The sentence in the lines 23 to 25 may be given as "It is obvious that the size dependent structural and energetic properties of nanoparticles are determined by the number of atoms in the nanoparticles." 4) In line 59, "... in [22]." May be given as "... in Ref. [22]." 5) The explanations between the lines 94 and 97 are not clear. They can be reorganized. 6) The sign "VH" is not correct, it must be "WH", must not? 7) "potential ionization" in line 123 and also in some other parts in MS can be as "ionization potential". 8) There is no suitable explanations about the data in Section 2. There are just list of numbers. There must be Table Captions and detailed explanations. 9) It is not necessary the numbers 47 in the second coulomb of the table. They can be removed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Agree, comment has been removed 2) We combined the sentences 3) Agree, sentence is changed 4) We take consider your comment 5) Is taken into account 6) Agree 7) Agree 8) We make change 9) Agree, they have been removed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>10) In Section 3, HUMO is not correct. It must be HOMO.</p> <p>11) There are words not correct. For example, stabile or stable? "quantium" or "quantum"? "accoding" or according"? etc. They should be corrected.</p> <p>12) In ref 7, "... and etc." Should be changed as "... et. al."</p> <p>13) In Conclusion, It is not good to give information about the affiliation.</p>	<p>10)Corrected</p> <p>11)Corrected</p> <p>12) Corrected</p> <p>13) Corrected</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Whole the paper should be restructured again, in my opinion. There should be an Introduction part. In this part a detailed analysis can be done for the literature. Methodology and the findings can be given in different sections via discussion and comparisons with other studies. Conclusion should be improved. Moreover, whole paper must be improved.</p>	