

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_89277
Title of the Manuscript:	Domain Structure in Ferroelectric 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:

(<https://www.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript entitled, " Domain Structure in Ferroelectric Thin Films " is very amazingly organized. After revising some important comments listed below, I recommend this paper for publication.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In abstract it says "In this work, we have considered the question from an analytical point of view, focusing on an interesting model introduced in a recent attempt by Lü and Cao [1]" what is the importance of this citation in in this part?2. An abstract is too narrowed, could you expand it?3. Introduction part it is better to use recent citations with order.4. This paper is journal, how Authors use pronounce "We" it should be corrected to 'Authors' or 'investigators or researchers'5. Using old information is not desirable. As a reviewer I suggest to use new reported works with respect to their findings specially (2019-2022)6. Comparisons are missed. Under Result authors should compare their results with previously reported.7. Revise conclusion with clear sentences and give directions for your findings.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. [1] have been removed from the abstract. The model makes use of the work by Lü and Cao2. The abstract has been expanded to clearly the problem that neccesitated the work.3. Recent citation have been included.4. Thank you very much, corrections have been done.5. New information has been added with recent citations.6. Results have been compared with those of other authors that are considered relevant in the field of specialization.7. The conclusion given are clearly inline with the objectives set for the work. Thank you.
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	