Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_99577**
Title of the Manuscript:	**OPTICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF NICKEL SULPHIDE THIN FILMS PREPARED BY CHEMICAL BATH DEPOSITION METHOD**
Type of the Article	**Research 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)	The research paper entitled "optical characterization of nickel sulphide thin films prepared by chemical bath deposition method" deals with study of variation of absorbance, reflectance, transmittance with time variation. The authors found that the nickel sulphide thin films have shown low values of above-mentioned parameters. The article contributes to the knowledge on thin films useful for electronic devices and solar cell materials.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	appropriate	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Abstract is comprehensive	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes Authors should provide the following in the manuscript 1. How have the authors calculated optical band gaps energy? What are equations, graphs used for this estimation? Cite relevant references. 2. At what temperature films have been prepared. 3. What is the stability of prepared films? 4. Are the films prepared hygroscopic? 5. Low absorbance is not only due to thinness? But the materials properties also play a role. What is material role in giving low absorbance and other properties.	
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)**	1. The reference cited are old and inadequate. Authors are advised to add more reference from the literature, particularly after 2019. Some of the references are given below, however authors are free select more. a. https://doi.org/10.2478/adms-2020-0015 b. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2019.11.068 c. https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.602-604.1423 d. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matchemphys.2015.08.002	
7. Figures	Figures are not drawn appropriately. Authors are suggested to redraw the figures 1. Remove the grids of x-axis and y-axis of figures. 2. In all Figures change the x-axis and redrawn it from 200 to 600 so that it gives clearly idea about the variations. 3. Mentions Units of the parameters taken on both x-axis and y-axis like wavelength (nm) etc. 4. All the figure captions should be below the figure (not on the top). 5. In Fig.5 and fig6. X-axis should cross the y-axis at -2 and -20 respectively instead of zero as shown.	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. Check the language. Sometimes uppercase letters are used without requirement. For example, in experimental section line number 3. 2. Somewhere subscripts and super scripts are not properly written. Check and revise.	
Optional/General comments	1. The discussion part should be further technically strengthened to give concrete analysis and support to the observation made on the samples. 2. Conclusion section needs revision.	

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:	**Gokarakonda Ramadevudu**
Department, University & Country	**Vasavi College of Engineering, India**