



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_24297
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterisation of Defects Induced by Ion-implantation Processing of P+N Shallow Junction Devices.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>A)Abstract</b> Describing language in a manuscript should be accurate. e.g. Line16 show more or less constant defect</p> <p><b>B)Introduction</b> Authors should add more latest developing trends and references and quote some paper from journals such as Physical Science International Journal</p> <p><b>C) METHODOLOGY</b> Fig.1 is not clear.</p> <p><b>D) RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> (1)Line 168 The defect level E (0.24) appears as a shoulder in the experimental samples, especially in samples P06 and P10. Authors should make more illustrations of the shoulder peak.</p> <p>(2)Line 178 the signal height does not change with the implantation energy. What does such phenomenon mean?</p> <p>(3) The nature of the defects could be viewed as a result of the amorphising implants creating a large number of Si interstitials. This is not quite clear that due to the amorphising implants, authors should</p>	<p>Agreed. Line 16: 'more or less' was deleted</p> <p>Agreed. 7 additional references added.</p> <p>Agreed. The Fig has been replaced by a more clearer one.</p> <p>(1)-Line 168: Authors are not clear what reviewer expects. Therefore no changes were made</p> <p>(2)-Line 178. The statement was deleted.</p> <p>(3). The statement was rephrased to read 'The formation of end of range dislocation loops could be attributed the amorphising implants creating a large number of Si interstitials beyond the</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>delete the content or make clear explanation here.</p> <p><b>E)Conclusions</b> Language should be re-organized.</p> <p><b>F)Reference</b> Format is not correct, and authors should make corrections according to journal's requirements. e.g. [5] Journal of Appl. Phys. 83 (1998) 3008 [6] <i>Phys. Rev. B</i> <b>69</b>, (2004). [10] Thermal and Mechanical Properties of Materials, 2005. The title and year, page format should be uniform.</p>	<p>amorphous/crystalline interface which upon annealing precipitates into extended defects-loops.</p> <p>Agreed. The conclusion was re-organized or re-written.</p> <p>Agreed. Corrections were made on the Format</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>(1)Line 215CONCLUSIONs→CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>(2)Line9 the device were of were evaluated</p> <p>(3)Line12 of all of both types</p> <p>(4)Line212 the main text should be departed form the figure title</p> <p>(5)Line217 The defect E(0.42) can only be associated with Ge implantation as it is not observed in reference sample P21.</p>	<p>Agreed &amp; attened.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<hr/>	<p>Thank you.</p>