



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_27566
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical and Electrochemical Deposition of Ag onto Si for Fabrication of Si Nanowires and the Seebeck Effect Characterization
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	<p>i) Author should incorporate the cross-sectional view of SiNW (SEM/FESEM image) to authenticate the formation of it. It is compulsory for the acceptance of this paper.</p> <p>ii) Author should incorporate the UV-vis spectra to differentiate the formation of SiNW and the Si.</p>	<p>1. Figure 4(a) contains the cross section view. More cross section image is not added because in earlier work performed by Zhang et al. (Nano Energy (2015) 13, 433–441) already addressed the morphology evolution clearly. We believe that the Si NW length, diameter and structure are not the focus of this work.</p> <p>2. We believe that UV-vis spectra are helpful. But sometimes it is hard in differentiating the formation of SiNW and the existing Si because of the high number of wires aggregating together.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	If possible author may incorporate the XRD images in log scale to check the presence of contaminants .	We totally agree with the reviewer that the XRD results will add the readability of the paper. But the EDX elemental analysis has provided us the validation on what types of possible contaminants are there. Therefore, in the revised version, the XRD results are not added.
Optional/General comments	Paper is well written. If the compulsory comments are cleared, this paper may be forwarded to eventual publication.	Thanks for the time of review.