



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_38163
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative study of two different media on the electropolymerization of 2-(9-ethylcarbazol-3-yliminomethyl)phenol: Cyclic voltammetry, impedance spectroscopy, XPS and UV-visible measurements
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>)

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	This article lacks focusing, the authors presented 20 figures and several tables and text enough to fill two pages of description of the results. Even with that there are incomplete work to report it as technical report. - Figure 10 , X axes , log V should be log (V/s), the values tells us the that authors used very fast scan rate (up to 500 V/s) this is not mentioned in the experimental section, otherwise the figure is wrong, the author/s has to plot change in pot vs log of Scan rate in V/s not mV/s , the Y axes units are in V . Recreation of this figure will generate results that needs discussion. The figure is wrong and has no relation to ref 10 they claimed , - Where are the optical band gap, the author/s did not again focus on the deep understanding of the band gap of these films, what was the rush for electrochromic (without even explanation of why such phenomena?). - EIS a lot of work with lack of discussion. Talking about semicircles that does not exist. - References are very limited 18 reference, for an article with 20 figure etc. - I felt that the authors wants to parade a lot figures.	[1] In Figure 10, X axe is log v (The unit is mV/s), it was a mistake and has been corrected. - The scan rates are from 20 to 500 mV/s and it is indicated in the legend of Figure 10. - The results were discussed in the paragraph preceding the figure 10. - Ref. 10 was removed. [2] The section 3.4. became 3.5. and the optical bandgap calculation and discussion was added. - The two sections 3.5. and 3.6 are merged. - The electrochromic part was removed, for lack of data needed for a deeper discussion. Unfortunately, we cannot carry out other measures for lack of means. [3] A discussion was developed. And section 3.5. became 3.4. [4] A number of references needed for discussion were added. [5] Fig 4a and 4b were combined. Fig 5a and 5b were combined.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		