



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Chemical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_60408
Title of the Manuscript:	Mechanism of the Electrochemical Deposition of a CoNiFe Alloy
Type of the 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1- The resolution Figure 1. Is very poor and x-axis and y-axis cannot be read. Moreover, there are 6 curves in the figure without legends!</p> <p>2- Figures (2, 3, 4, and 5) needs to more details specially x-axis and y-axis</p> <p>3- The whole manuscript should be thoroughly checked to remove many language mistakes including spelling. For example in section 2 line11 "toe" should be "too", in section 4 " CoNiFE" should be "Co Ni Fe" , in section 5 "Discussion of results " should be "Results and Discussion " and so many others. Frankly, the English should be seriously double checked.</p> <p>4- The conclusion part should be improved through the applications of mechanical and electrical properties !</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. "PARTIAL ION CURRENTS" section needs more clarification</p> <p>2- It is better to use Scanning electron microscope(SEM) images to determine the particles of Co ,Ni and Fe at the surface ?also XRD a play a key role to determine crystal structure of material</p> <p>3- Why dose electrolyte heat to temperature 70<sup>0</sup>C</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The results are worth publishing, however, the authors should do <b>above</b> changes in the manuscript in order to improve both scientific level and English.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ghazwan Ghazi Ali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mosul, Iraq</b>