



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:	
Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9672
Title of the Manuscript:	Rapid chemical bath deposition and optical property of CuS films using sodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate as chelating agent

PART 2:	
FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
3) I cannot identify which are the particles in Figure 2. The authors should identify the particle by means of a circle or any type of indicators. 4) The deposition rate at different EDTA-2Na:Cu ²⁺ conditions in Figure 3 should be added as the evidence which clearly show the existence of maximum deposition rate. 5) The composition of CuS and Cu ₂ S in the film should be given. The authors mentioned Cu ₂ S were covered with CuS in Figure 1. The considerable decrease in transmittance after long deposition, in Fig. 4 (b), was explained relating to higher transmittance of Cu ₂ S than CuS. This means that content of Cu ₂ S was maximum at EDTA-2Na: Cu ²⁺ =1.0. Was the maximum deposition rate achieved by Cu ₂ S, not by CuS ? If the contribution of Cu ₂ S was large at EDTA-2Na: Cu ²⁺ =1.0, I must recognize that the authors chose the unsuitable condition for CuS deposition. 8) Many grammatical errors still remain.	3). The particles are identified by indicators. 4). A plot of deposition vs. EDTA-2Na/Cu was inserted into the figure 3. 5). The samples were fabricated two years ago and now is lose, so the composition of CuS and CuS can not be given. Line 119--121, the sentences related to higher transmittance of Cu ₂ S than CuS have been removed. 6). The English language has been carefully corrected.