Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_115278**
Title of the Manuscript:	**OPTICAL PROPERTIES OF A THIN LAYER OF ANTIMONY SELENIDE USING CHEMICAL BATH DEPOSITION METHOD.**
Type of the Article	**FULL LENGTH**

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Only if the novelty of the work is stated** **Yes** **No. Introduction, methods, conclusion and recommendations are lacking** **Yes. But they need to be numbered appropriately** **Yes** **Yes. Though they're few, and there are no literature comparing the results of the study.** 1. The abstract is incomplete: The introduction is missing, there are punctuation issues, the methods is insufficient, conclusion and recommendations are missing. There is nothing like ammonium solution. We either have ammonia solution or ammonium hydroxide. 2. In the introduction, check punctuations. For instance, line 3 should have silicon-based instead of silicon based. The end of paragraph 1 should have a full stop. 3. Introduction should be number 1, experimental methods number 2, results number 3, conclusion number 4. 4. A paragraph should be at least 6 lines. Check paragraph 2 of the introduction. Either merge it with 3 or lengthen it. 5. In paragraph 3 of the introduction, define EDTA at its mention (the one in the abstract is not considered here). Also, consider removing the coma at the second mention of EDTA. 6. What is the novelty/ new about the work? 7. In experimental methods, correct the ammonium solution. Define EDTA in the introduction, and just use the abbreviation in this section. Do the same to Antimony trichloride and Sodium hydrogen selenium oxide. You don't have to list all the materials. just mention the important ones like the balance and the hydrochloric acid. Provide more information about them. For the apparatus, give the serial numbers, the manufacturers, and the place of manufacture. For the chemical, mention the manufacturer and the percentage purity. Check grammar. For instance, thin films can be deposited in different kinds, not on different kinds. 8. Can you explain the procedure you used to clean the substrates. Where did you obtain the slides from, were they normal glass, quartz, silica …? What were their dimensions? 9. Provide information about the spectrophotometer: manufacturer and country of manufacture 10. Is the line just before list 1 necessary? What information does it give? Since it just a line, I	

	suggest you merge it with the previous paragraph. Again, avoid using words line “below” and “above”. Instead, use the number of the table eg table 1, table 2, figure 1 etc. check this throughout. Also, use “table” instead of “list”. Check this throughout. 11. What are the units of the values in table 1? Include the unit(s). 12. In results and discussion, consider using a better plotting software for plotting better graphs in all the figures. 13. A look at figure 1 does not tally with the methods in section 2. Did you mention slides 1-4 in the materials section? This needs to be addressed. Also, avoid using “slides” but instead, use the parameter that was changing. 14. Give meaning to your results. An example is figure 2, where you should explain the cause of the high transmittance 15. The first arrow in figure 4 is not correct. The band gap is obtained by extrapolating the line to touch the energy axis. 16. Consider merging figures 1 and 5, 2 and 6, 3 and 7, and 4 and 8, then explain them together in the pairs. 17. Comparisons between your results and the data in the literature is seriously lacking. Read the literature and obtain data for comparison and also to boost your arguments. 18. The conclusion lacks recommendations	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes. Just minor grammar and punctuations need to be corrected	
Optional/General comments	The paper is good, but lacks novelty and discussions	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nicholas Ongwen**
Department, University & Country	**Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya**