



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
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

**PART 2:**

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1) The sentence in the line 6 in Abstract there are Refernces number as "[2, 3]". It is not good to put Ref. numbers in Abstract.	Corrected
2) There is still no suitable explanations for the data in Section 2. There are just list of numbers. They should be tabulated and there must be Table Captions and detailed explanations. In the present form it is still in complicated form, isn't it?	Corrected
3) As I pointed out, whole paper should be restructured again, in my opinion. There should be Sections, for example, 1) Introduction, 2) Methodology, 3) Results and Discussion and 4) Conclusions. A detailed analysis should be done for the literature in Introduction. The considered theoretical approaches should be presented in Section 2. Findings with their analysis, critics and comparisons with other studies should be in Section 3. Conclusion should be improved with giving brief novelty and suggestions.	The paper is reconstructed as per your comment.
4) The references are not in the same format some of the journals' names are open and in long form however some of them are in a short form. They should be in the same format.	Corrected
5) I would like to say also that the paper can not be called as a Review paper, there should be relatively more information in the MS.	It the version of the journal.