



SDI Review Form 1.6

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
Type of the Article	Method 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/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The author/s investigated CuS films by chemical bath deposition process in an aqueous solution of cupric acetate, thiourea, and sodium ethylenediamine tetraacetate (EDTA-2Na) with different contents at 50 °C. The photoluminescence is not my speciality, but I can review the other parts of manuscript.</p> <p>To producing of CuS thin films was very difficult work with chemical bath deposition. You must control the bath, very well. So, I think that we must accept this manuscript. Among them, I want to a minor revision to the author/s:</p> <p>-“the average particle size increased and particle morphology tended to be rodlike” but AFM images don’t show this symptom. Please, delete to this sentence or added to AFM images, clearly.</p> <p>- Please, add to literature for relation of film thickness and deposition rate.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer