



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	English is not satisfactory: There are a lot of grammar faults and some sentences structures are not good. 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.	
Minor REVISION comments	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. In section 4, the author begins his conclusion by saying "Cu ₂ SnSe ₃ 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.	
Optional/General 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nicole Doumit
Department, University & Country	Laboratoire GREMAN, INSA Centre Val de Loire, France