



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_29024
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Annealing Temperature on the Physical Properties of Polycrystalline Cu ₂ SnSe ₃ Thin Films Prepared by Thermal Vacuum Evaporation Technique
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>English is not satisfactory: There are a lot of grammar faults and some sentences structures are not good.</p> <p>In section 2, the author mentions that the thickness of the films was determined by a profilometer or "surface profiler". However, no concept or thickness measurements were shown in the manuscript. It is very important to show these results and discuss about them.</p>	<p>Authors have been checking all the grammatical error.</p> <p>Yes, authors were using profilometer to check the films thickness. However, the measurement technique has been reported in other published journal by the same authors. Thickness in this manuscript is important only for I-V measurement and electrical properties calculations.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In section 2, the author talks about annealing. It would be better to mention the time of each annealing: is it a long or a short cycle annealing? 1 hour, 2 hours, 8 hours? And please provide pictures of samples.</p> <p>In section 4, the author begins his conclusion by saying "Cu₂SnSe₃ films show a strong dependence on the film deposition technique, annealing condition and annealing temperature." However, he shows only one deposition technique (Thermal Vacuum Evaporation Technique) and he does not mention the annealing condition. Conclusion must be reformulated.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments. As mentioned earlier the time for annealing is 2 hours. It is similar for all works and published paper done by the authors. This manuscript focus on different annealing temperature using constant time of annealing.</p> <p>Author decided to remain this conclusion because we try to compare the annealing temperature that shows the correlation between thermal vacuum deposition, condition and other parameters.</p> <p>Authors had been discussed more details about this phenomenon at different journal suach as:</p> <p>1. Mohd Amirul Syafiq Mohd Yunos, Zainal</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>Abidin Talib, Wan Mahmood Mat Yunus, <i>Annealing and Light Effect on Structural and Electrical Properties of Thermally Evaporated Cu₂SnSe₃ Thin Films</i>, Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science 2 (2011) 103-109</p> <p>2. Mohd Amirul Syafiq Mohd Yunus, Zainal Abidin Talib, Wan Mahmood Mat Yunus, Josephine Liew Ying Chyi and Wilfred Sylvester Paulus, <i>X-Ray Diffraction Analysis Of Thermally Evaporated Copper Tin Selenide Thin Films At Different Annealing Temperature</i>, Jurnal Sains Nuklear Malaysia, 23 (2011) 46-52.</p> <p>3. Mohd Amirul Syafiq Mohd Yunus, Zainal Abidin Talib, Wan Mahmood Mat Yunus, <i>Influence of Annealing Temperature on the Physical Properties of Polycrystalline Cu₂SnSe₃ Thin Films Prepared by Thermal Vacuum Evaporation Technique</i>, Internationals Journal of Materials Research 7 (2012) 79-92.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some sentences were written in active form. Personally, I prefer them to be in passive form like the most of the sentences in the manuscript.	