SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	1) The authors should write the value of increase in the deposition rate comparing with the previous studies, because "fast fabrication" was stated in line 48. 2) The authors should explain the mechanism why 50 ^{o}C was good and room temperature was not good. (Line 61-63) 3) The uniform particles could not be identified in Figure 2. How was their average size (increased from which to which)? Three-dimensional indication is especially welcome. 4) The authors mentioned that the maximum deposition rate was obtained at DETA-2Na:Cu^{2+}=1.0 as shown in Figure 3. However, for obtaining this conclusion, more data points should be necessary, such as those at 0.75 and 1.25. Only one maximum point without the trend around it might be caused by any accident. 5) The composition of CuS and Cu_2S in the film should be given. The authors mentioned Cu_2S decreased with the increase in deposition time in Figure 1. However, the decrease in transmission after long deposition was explained relating to higher transmittance of Cu_2S than CuS. There might be contradiction. 6) In the characterization, film quality, band gap, and transmittance, changing with the deposition condition, should be discussed relating to any crystallographic evidence. 7) If the high deposition rate was the novelty, its extent should be clearly mentioned with referring evidences.	
Minor REVISION comments	1) Please explain the information included in Figures 4	

	(a) and (c).	
Optional/General comments	Line 45: “niktrate” should be “nitrate”. Line 100 and 103: “Cu^{2+} anion” should be “Cu^{2+} cation”	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer