

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_123147
Title of the Manuscript:	Density Functional Theory(DFT) Study of Alkali-Metal-Based Half-Heusler Compound NaCrSb
Type of the 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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 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)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Comments</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Abstract is very simple. It is advised to elaborate the abstract by including details of softwares etc.</li><li>2. Explain detail about method of calculation. Put more details about the convergence tests.</li><li>3. Improve the language of the manuscript and typing error.</li><li>4. In Literature review no previous studies has been included. Author should re-write it.</li><li>5. The author study the elastic properties, Author should analyze all the results.</li><li>6. Very less explanation for PDOS and Phonons have been given in the manuscript. Author should analyze it.</li><li>7. Format of references is also different for each reference. It should be same. Author should increase the number of references.</li></ol>	

### PART 2:

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anita Rani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Guru Nanak College for Girls, India</b>