



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_18553
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrical and photoelectric properties of crystal InGaTe2
Type of the 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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The work that the authors carried out is scientific and good. But the way they presented is too poor. Even a single sentence is correct. Unless otherwise the manuscript is completely rewritten. For an example, a sentence is in the text</p> <p>"The monocrystal <i>InGaTe</i> grown up by the Bridgeman method process tetragonal syngony of crystal structure with optical symmetry $D (mcm)_{h14184}$ with lattice parameter $a = 8,463\text{\AA}$ and $c = 6,981\text{\AA}$ the samples for measurements were cut out from an ingot in the form of a rectangle with the sizes $6 \times 3 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$ and with such an orientation that the lighting happens in the direction parallel to the crystallography axes"</p> <p>What it means? What do the authors mean optical symmetry? What does it mean "syngony"?</p> <p>Similarly I can find hundreds of mistakes and doubts.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Sacred Heart College, Tirupattur, India