



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_12924
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TEMPERATURE ON THE IRON SULPHUR RATIO OF PYRITE DEPOSITED BY AEROSOL ASSISTED CHEMICAL VAPOUR DEPOSITION METHOD
Type of the Article	Original Research 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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors report that Pyrite semiconducting film was deposited on a glass substrate from a single source precursor ($\text{FeS}_2\text{CN}(\text{Et})_2$) using aerosol assisted chemical vapour deposition with temperatures of 300 to 450 °C. Hence, the paper will be of interest to researchers in the field of photovoltaic application. A minor revision is necessary before the publication in Physical Science International Journal. Here are the comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A special section "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" must be added. 2. Line 98 of page 3, the authors mentioned that the preferred orientations of films were deposited. Is there any proof? The preferred orientations of each phase can be calculated by XRD. 3. In future, advice should be asked from someone who is more fluent in writing scientific papers in the English language 	<p>Line 90 of page 3, already contained "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" and we felt that introducing a new or special section with another "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" is counterproductive and hence there might not be need for its inclusion.</p> <p>We have made the correction on Line 98 of page 3 and we also need to state that the preferred orientation is always seen on the peak with the highest intensity where the diffraction is most pronounced in the p-XRD pattern. In our case (200) plane of reflection is the preferred orientation as shown on line 102, and Figure 1 on line 103.</p>