

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_98235
Title of the Manuscript:	Photovoltaic Potential of Hawleyite Cadmium Sulphide (CdS) Nanofilms
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:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community. It will contribute additional information on the photovoltaic studies. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. Yes, it is comprehensive. Yes, they are appropriate. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. No, some of the references are old. I suggested that the author should use references starting from 2003 (that is, references within 10 years). Equation 6 is missed, so it needs corrections.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is clear.	
Optional/General comments	In general, this manuscript is good.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Derbie Gont
Department, University & Country	Debre Berhan University, Ethiopia