



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9672
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Rapid chemical bath deposition and optical property of CuS films using sodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate as chelating agent</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Method Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The work is very simple. The deposition has been carried out in a furnace. I am not sure how the substrates are placed vertically. If not then the film may not be uniform. Have the author measured any electrical properties of the film. Is the film adhering the substrate. Has the scotch tape test performed? Below are some other comments.</b></p> <p><b>1. Is it possible to improve the AFM images?</b></p> <p><b>2. Indexing of peak at nearly 50 degree is not correct.</b></p> <p><b>3. References are not up-to-date.</b></p> <p><b>4. What happens to Cu<sub>2</sub>S when experiment is carried out for longer time?</b></p> <p><b>5. Page 8, please correct the sentence; The films showed the emission peaks entered at ~443 nm.</b></p> <p><b>6. Abstract: correct 'with different contents at 50 ' The band gap energy of 13 the films ranged from 2.59–2.92 eV.</b></p>	<p>The substrates were placed vertically by leaning against beaker wall.</p> <p>The electrical properties were not measured and the scotch tape test was not performed.</p> <p>The films are good adhered on the substrate.</p> <p>1. These experiments were carried out two years ago, some samples are lose. So that re-measurement is not possible. We have made some contrast enhancement to the images, now they may be more clear.</p> <p>2. At nearly 50 degree, no XRD peaks are found.</p> <p>3. The references are up to date.</p> <p>4. Line 86, sentence: "This could be due to CuS is formed at initial stage of the film deposition and covered by CuS with films further deposition." is added.</p> <p>5. Sentence: "The films showed the emission peaks entered at ~443 nm" is corrected as "The films showed the emission peaks centered at ~443 nm"</p> <p>6. In abstract, sentence: "...and sodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate (EDTA-2Na) with different contents at 50 " is corrected as "...and different contents of sodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate (EDTA-2Na) at 50 ";</p> <p>The sentence: "The band gap energy of 13 the films ranged from 2.59–2.92 eV. is corrected as "The band gap energy of the films is in the range of</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>7. Please select proper keywords</b></p> <p><b>8. Please brief up the choice of words.</b></p> <p><b>9. What about the stability of copper sulfides.</b></p> <p><b>10. Page 2 line 37 what is the a large surface area mean here</b></p> <p><b>11. There are sentence structure errors in second last paragraph of introduction.</b></p>	<p>2.59–2.92 eV ”;</p> <p>7.Proper keywords are selected;</p> <p>8.ok</p> <p>9.line 95, ”and very stability in aqueous environment” is added;</p> <p>10. Line 38, “a large surface area” has been corrected as “suiting large surface area deposition”;</p> <p>11. The sentence structure errors in second last paragraph of introduction have been carefully corrected.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Needs to be corrected thoroughly.	The manuscript has been thoroughly corrected.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		