

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_121196
Title of the Manuscript:	First Principles Study of Structural, Electronic, Mechanical and Density of State Properties of the Half - Heusler Alloy NaCrGe
Type of the Article	Theoretical

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	1-The research title is repeated in the conclusion. 2- This sentence is scientifically incorrect: The material NaCrGe is considered hybrids between metals and semiconductors. Hence, NaCrGe is Half-metallic heusler alloy.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	no	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1-Please add sources of equations used 2- Source 13 and 14 without a title for the research, please rephrase it	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	weak	
Optional/General comments	1- Taking more than one model by controlling x or y or z 2- A study of the alpha, beta and gamma phases of the compound 3-Talks more about how the compound was modeled and how to obtain the optimum for the compound 4-Transferring the program steps from the research to the appendix to the research 5-Equation No. 1 must be verified in its formulation 6- Adding definitions to the equation symbols and also to their sources 7- Adding the total state density for all compounds 8- From Table No. 1, the value of the minimum energy in electron volts is negative and this is incorrect [Where this minimum energy is designated as ground state energy, the optimum volume is the volume of that system having minimum energy (ground state energy). 9- Table No. 2 The value of Cp is not present 10- Table No. 2 the value of the ratio B/G is not accurate 11- Discussion of the results is poor and needs to be reviewed 12-The absence of conflict of interest from the research was not mentioned	

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:	Mohammed L. Jabbar
Department, University & Country	Thi-Qar University, Iraq