Response to Reviewer Comments for: “Thickness optimization of ultrathin nickel films as transparent conductive electrodes”

**Author:**

Peter Wojdylo (wojdylp@mcmaster.ca)

McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Canada.

**Response Letter:**

I extend my thanks to all reviewers and editors for their advice on improving my paper. Specific comments are addressed below. A clean edited document, .tex file, .bib file, and a marked up document showing specific changes have been submitted post-revision. Please consider publishing my revised article, “Thickness optimization of ultrathin nickel films as transparent conductive electrodes” in the McMaster Journal of Engineering Physics.

Sincerely,

Peter Wojdylo.

**Editor Comments:**

1. Footer changes sides between pages.

-Footer has been confined to the right side.

2. References should follow the citation guide. Adjust the .bib file to remove the urls, and make any other changes to conform.

-.bib file has been edited to remove urls, DOIs, ISSNs, and ISBNs.

**Reviewer A Comments:**

The author would like to thank Reviewer A for their kind words and recommendation to publish without further revision.

**Reviewer B Comments:**

1. This sentence seems to be stating that the complex index of refraction is equal to a real index summed with an imaginary one; the refractive index is by definition complex and is therefore n + ik is not solely the complex index of refraction. The term ik is generally used to represent a relation to the dielectric constant so it would also be reasonable to use kappa to avoid confusion with the wave vector k.

-Complex index of refraction has been explicitly defined as to eliminate confusion with the real part . Imaginary part has been relabeled as .

2. This stability has been mentioned a few times, is this a mechanical stability issue like buckling? Or some sort of resonance or modulation stability?

-No changes made. Sentence specifically mentions “long-term stability”, implying the ability of films to maintain their function over time without degradation. This definition is commonplace in the discipline.

3. The references seem to be quite long. Perhaps removing the URL links might help provide some space if you wanted to add anything from other reviews.

-References were edited as per the editor’s suggestions, which included removing URLs.

**Reviewer C Comments:**

No comments to address.