



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_38745
Title of the Manuscript:	Opt electrical effects of Ag nanoparticles ink on Cerium Titanium ternary Films
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	The abstract starts with a long introduction part, which is not necessary. The newly found results should have been reported in more detail. Also, this introduction (solar cell applications) is not in coherence with the results (wide bandgap materials which are not suitable for solar cells). On the other hand, in the introduction part, the authors do not even refer to solar cells. The possible application area is not written clearly. The coherence is low. Figure 1 is depicted in a clean way. It is not easy to read. It should be revised. The explanations in 3.3.2 is not clear. In the Figure, 2 % is seen, in the text 20% is written. There is no numerical result in Section 3.3.3. Table II does not give information. It is not possible to understand under which conditions the bandgaps are obtained. The contribution of this research to the literature should be clarified. Otherwise it just looks like a report.	NOTED
Minor REVISION comments	There are some grammar mistakes in the text. Careful inspection is needed (Some are highlighted.)	
Optional/General comments		