



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_8704
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of the etching rates in three-dimensional simulations of the profile evolution
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		All the Referee's comments were included in the revised manuscript. We would like to thank the Referee for help us to improve our manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author/authors systematically studied the role of the etching rates in three-dimensional simulations of the profile evolution. This paper is likely to be helpful and informative for future studies. It seems to be the publishing standard. 1. Is the paper of sufficient scientific interest and has originality in its technical content to merit publication? Yes, it has a sufficient interest in scientific terms. Furthermore, it has originality in its technical content to merit publication. 2. If the paper is generally acceptable, are there any errors of fact, logic or interpretation which need correction(s)? No, there aren't any errors of fact, logic or interpretation which need corrections.	Thank you very much for the Referee's affirmative comments. Thank you very much for the Referee's affirmative comments.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Is the paper well written and the presentation clear and concise? If not, which portions or parts including tables and figures, need deletion, recasting or condensation. Yes, it is well written and the presentation clear and concise. 4. (i) Have the authors cited the relevant literature? Yes, they have cited the relevant literature. (ii) Is there any cited document, which, in your opinion, is superfluous or irrelevant? In my opinion, there isn't any superfluous or irrelevant in the document. All references made necessary and appropriate. 5. Is the abstract sufficiently informative, concise, and clear? Yes, it is sufficiently informative, concise and clear. It should state briefly the purpose of the paper, the principal results and major conclusions.	
--	--	--