SCIENCEDOMAIN international



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	
Final comments(FC) with the previous questions(Q) and answers(A):Q3) 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.A3). The particles are identified by indicators.FC3) I still cannot recognize which is the particle. Where is the boundary?	Line 100, Sentence: "In these micrographs, bright parts could be images of the particles while dark parts should be images of boundary and gaps between the particles" is added.	
 Q4) The deposition rate at different EDTA-2Na:Cu²⁺ conditions in Figure 3 should be added as the evidence which clearly show the existence of maximum deposition rate. A4). A plot of deposition vs. EDTA-2Na/Cu was inserted into the figure 3. FC4) I drew the following figure using the plots at 1 hr in Figure 3; I added the line obtained using the least squares method. I believe the relationship between the thickness and EDTA-2Na/Cu should be recognized like this, if the data are limited to those only in this manuscript. 	Your drew figure is inserted in figure 3.	
$\begin{array}{c} 400 \\ \hline \\ 300 \\ \hline \\ 300 \\ \hline \\ 200 \\ \hline \\ 200 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ 100 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline$		
Q5) 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. A5). The samples were fabricated two years ago and now is lose, so the composition of Cu ₂ S than CuS and CuS can not be given. Line 119121, the sentences related to higher transmittance of Cu ₂ S than CuS have been removed. FC5) Finally, the contradiction remained.	Line 123, sentence: "In addition, the transmittance is also associated with average particle size, composition, crystallinity, crystal orientation to some extent" is added. It is worth to note that the Cu ₂ S has an larger optical band gap than CuS.	