



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_17250
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of gamma radiation in undoped SnO ₂ thin films
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract – Doesn't provide the whole picture of the paper. The author only has described about the findings on the study of 659nm thickness only.</p> <p>Experimental Procedure</p> <p>2.1 In the procedure there was 4 samples prepared but in result and discussion only two samples were discussed.</p> <p>Result and Discussion</p> <p>3.4 Optical band gap –The author has explained about the findings on the relationship between the thickness and the transmission of the findings without the support of the data. If the author wishes to provide the findings without the support of the data then this statement should be backed with a reference.</p> <p>For explanation of Figure1 there glass substrate studied and it was not clear about the status of the glass substrate whether it is the platform for thin film deposition or it is another control sample?</p> <p>According to the title this paper was suppose to study the effect of gamma radiation on thin films but the data given in Figure 1 doesn't show the effect on the thin film before the gamma radiation.</p> <p>In explanation for Figure 1 the author also has done a comparison for the transmission in terms of percentage</p>	<p>What does it mean (Structural, optical and electrical properties were studied) ?</p> <p>We concentrate on the extreme film thickness in this paper.</p> <p>It is explained.</p> <p>OK</p> <p>What is the problem ?</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>but it is not clear for which wavelength was the comparison has done since the graph covers a broad range.</p> <p>The author also has discussed about absorption coefficient without the proof of data and reference.</p> <p>Figure 2 only shows about the study of 191nm thickness and the other samples were not included.</p> <p>The author has mentioned about the refractive index for a range 191-659nm but the presented data only shows one sample which is 659nm.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The paper also lacks in the scope of study and as a result no clear conclusion was driven. As the transmittance and extinction coefficient discussed were for two different samples.</p> <p>Please clarify the ethical issues if any</p>	<p>In the visible range</p> <p>OK</p> <p>This is the other extreme of the film thickness.</p> <p>To reduce the figure numbers.</p> <p>I think it is reasonable.</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author lacks support of data and reference in his explanation and the paper lacks continuity. The samples were not tested constantly as the parameter of testing varies as for example 191nm sample was only tested with transmittance. Where as the 659nm sample was tested with absorption coefficient and refractive index. Data on 232nm and 478nm samples were not provided but in the explanation the author has commented on a broad range from 191nm-659nm.	No comments