SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_47106**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Annealing and Thickness on Some Physical Characteristics of ZnO Films**
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	The authors are trying to synthesize different ZnO films with different thicknesses and study its optical and structural properties. However, the current work is substandard and should not be accepted in its current form. 1. The English of this manuscript is seriously bad. Therefore it is strongly advised to rewrite most of the parts of the manuscript. 2. Abstract should be carefully rewritten according to the finding of the work. 3. In experimental part the authors have written the substrate was preheated at 400oC prior to the coating. Please explain why it was done? 4. The authors have written in the experiment that they got highly adhesive ZnO film. How did the authors confirm about the adhesiveness of the films. Provide the sufficient proofs in the manuscript. For example: SEM microstructure of film cross-sections, or any adhesive tape test result as per ASTM standard. 5. The authors have reported that they measured the film thickness by gravimetric method. I have doubt about the measurement by this method. It is strongly suggested to clarify the thickness measurement with sufficient proof. 6. In structural characterization section the authors have mention that "strongest peaks …….structure of ZnO". How can authors attribute all the ZnO peaks as the strongest? 7. How the authors confirm that "better crystallinity is proportional to the thickness"? Please clarify. 8. In throughout the manuscript the authors have said that all films are annealed at 500 ^{o}C. But, they have not mention about the annealing time and also the procedure. Please clarify about the annealing atmosphere also. 9. Why the strain (%) is same in both as-deposited and annealed 410nm ZnO film? 10. How the grain sizes of the films were calculated? The authors are saying that they have calculated crystallite size from Scherrer formula. The reviewer wants to convey that the crystallite size and the grain size are completely different entity.	

	Please explain. 11. Thickness is proportional to photon energy….why? 12. Which samples are showing better optical properties… as-deposited or annealed? Please explain… if no, then why annealing is required? 13. The conclusion should be clearly re-written with important observations and findings of the work	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	***Harekrushna Sutar***
Department, University & Country	***Indira Gandhi Institute of Technology, India***