



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_13299
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATIONS MICRORELIEF OF THE SURFACE, DIELECTRIC PROPERTIES AND FLUORESCENCE SPECTRUM OF NATURAL COMPOSITE - FISH SCALES
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	<p>This manuscript presents a study on surface microrelief, frequency dependence of the dielectric permittivity, dielectric loss, surface charge density and the fluorescence of spectra of Kutum fish scales - matrix. This work is interesting and valuable for the development of multi-functional devices based on fish scales Kutum in the future. However, there are some problems in this paper listed below, which need mandatory revision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In "EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION", Note that authors discussed the experimental results simply and did not cite related references, please authors discussed the experimental results in detail and cite several related references to support the experimental results. 2. The authors must invite an expert in physics to read this work carefully and improve the language of this paper. 3. In caption of figure 7, I cannot understand what "different points of fish scale" is. The author should provide a figure of the fish scale to show where the points are. 4. Line176: The figure 1 is not clear, please give 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We corrected the "EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" 2. The manuscript has been corrected. 3. We corrected the caption of all figures and edited the all figures in manuscript. 4. In line the figure 1 is replaced by original. 5. In the whole text and captions of the figures, the label "Fig.1", "Figure 2" and so on are replaced by Figure1 figure 2. 6. We corrected the all figures in manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>clearer figure 1.</p> <p>5. In the whole text and captions of the figures, the label “Fig.1”, “Figure 2” and so on should be uniform.</p> <p>6. The axis labels of Fig.3, 4, 5 and 7 are not clear. Please improve them.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. In Page 1, “HDPE”, The authors should write completely when you use at first time.</p> <p>2. Line 66: The <i>d</i> should be thickness not the diameter.</p> <p>3. Line 110: “34.72-to 10.97 ” should be “34.72 to 10.97”.</p> <p>4. Line 125: 10-8s should be 10⁻⁸s.</p> <p>5. Line 176: 80–nm should be 80 nm.</p>	<p>In page 1 HDPE replaced by high density polyethylene (HDPE)</p> <p>2.In line 66 the d is thickness</p> <p>3. We corrected all the manuscript</p> <p>4.In line 125 10-8s replaced to 10⁻⁸s</p> <p>5 in line 176 80–nm replaced 80 nm.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		