

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_126775
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Cerium (Ce) doping on the Optical properties of silver sulphide (Ag <sub>2</sub> S) and silver sulphide (Ce: Ag <sub>2</sub> S) thin films deposited by electrodeposition method.
Type of the Article	Original article

#### 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>

#### 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript gives useful information on Ag<sub>2</sub>S and Ce: Ag<sub>2</sub>S</li> <li>2. It can be used in many application like optoelectronics and photodetecting devices.</li> <li>3. Findings suggest that Ce doping can adjust Ag<sub>2</sub>S optical properties, which is especially useful for customizing the substance for particular optoelectronic uses.</li> </ol>	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Making it a strong candidate (instead strong candidate technical word like making it an attractive option or alternate promising material, etc..can be used)</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the subsection 3.1 bracket need to be removed</li> </ol>	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With electrodeposition's confirmed capacity to produce consistent, repeatable thin films with exact control over doping levels, its usage as a fabrication technique is well-justified.</li> <li>2. By comparing the work with other scientifically credible manuscripts, the manuscript demonstrates its scientific strength.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Grammar may be fine tune	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Hence, in this paper we report the influence of cerium (ce) – in the abstract (ce) should be changed as (Ce)</li><li>2. In experimental- After stirring for 5 minutes, 20 ml of 0.05M of sodium thiosulphate- 0.005 M of sodium thiosulphate – of should be deleted</li><li>3. dissolve the EDTAThe – full stop is missing between EDTA and The</li><li>4. 10 minute – all places 10 minutes has to be changed</li><li>5. equation (1) and (2) – equations (1) and (2)</li><li>6. Figure captions may fine tune</li><li>7. Reference in in conclusion has to be deleted -should not show the result obtained by other authors – need to report present results (Agbo and Nwofe, 2015) and 2.01 to 2.23 eV obtained by (Adelifard and Torkamani, 2015). (Pacheco-Salazar <i>et al.</i>, 2020; Liang <i>et al.</i>, 2017; Cheng <i>et al.</i>,2016).</li></ol>	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>M.Sudha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sengunthar Engineering college, India</b>