

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_120387
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of the characteristics of thermoelectrics with high and ultra-high values of the Seebeck coefficient
Type of the Article	Original 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This present study will be useful to improve the efficiency of thermoelectric power devices. And resistivity calculations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Study of the characteristics of thermoelectrics with high and ultra-high values of the Seebeck coefficient	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, this Manuscript requires more additional points on calculations and graphical analysis.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		No
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	Yes, but if the author add the following references it would be better. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tejeswararao, P., K. V. Ramesh, and D. L. Sastry. "Thermoelectric power measurements of GeO₂ substituted PbO–V₂O₅ semiconducting glass system." <i>Physics and Chemistry of Glasses-European Journal of Glass Science and Technology Part B</i> 64.3 (2023): 81-83. 2. Rao, P. Tejeswara. "ESR and FT-IR studies on GeO₂ substituted lead vanadate semiconducting glass system." <i>International Journal of Structural Glass and Advanced Materials Research</i> 3.1 (2019): 21-27. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language is to be improved a lot throughout the manuscript. 2. Through out the manuscript use multiplication symbol instead of dot to mention the Seebeck coefficient values. 3. Introduction should be in a way to talk about importance of Thermoelectrics in past studies and uses of this work in future. 4. Clarity is missing in results and discussions. 5. Results should be explained with proper examples from previous references. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P.Tejeswara Rao
Department, University & Country	GITAM(Deemed To Be University), India