SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJR2P_64883**
Title of the Manuscript:	**First principles Investigation of Structure and electronic properties of NiTe2 Fermi Crossing Type-II Dirac Semimetal.**
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/journal/10/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	**Dear authors** **In the manuscript entitled " First principles Investigation of Structure and electronic properties of NiTe2 Fermi Crossing Type-II Dirac Semimetal." Authors performed first principles calculation on NiTe2 in order to understand the structural and electronic properties of these compounds. The manuscript is poorly written and need major revision and inputs in order to consider for publication.** **1. " Generally, our structural parameters for all NiTe2 compounds are in agreement with X-ray diffraction Rietveld refinement studies." Since this study doesn' t perform XRD measurements, proper reference should be given.** **2. There are so many, words, phrases, sentences which should be corrected/replaced to give correct meaning. Few of them are** **3. Why not use an approximation of LDA instead of GGA?** **4. Why not compare your work with similar theoretical work?** **5. Why are some references from so many years ago?**	Thank you very much for your suggestion to improve the quality of our manuscript. The corrections has been made in the revised manuscript. 1. Proper reference has been included in the revised manuscript. 2. Improper Words/pharases has been changed in the revised manuscript. 3. Reason has been stated in the revised manuscript. 4. Comparison with similar theoretical work has been made in the revised manuscript. 5. Latest references has been included in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	