SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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
Compulsory REVISION comments	**In this manuscript, the authors focus on the thermoelectric property of porous Si nanowire arrays fabricated by the chemically and electrochemically deposition and etching methods. Especially, the Seebeck coefficient of Si nanowire arrays, which have controlled using the etching process time parameter, is well investigated and organized in the manuscript. In my opinion, this manuscript should appeal to the broad readership of *Physical Science International Journal*, including researchers in the field of Nano-materials and Thermoelectrics. Although the manuscript comprehensively investigated and organized well, several issues given below should be commented prior to publication.** **1. The mechanism of increase in Seebeck coefficient should be described. The Authors claimed that the Seebeck coefficient of the electrochemically deposited sample is larger than those of pristine and chemically deposited samples. However, the manuscript doesn't provide sufficient physical explanation.** **2. In the electrochemically deposited sample, the Authors claimed that the Seebeck coefficient depends on the etching time. But the result of 30min doesn't follow this trend. Practically, only 3 different conditions were performed. To claim the etching time dependence, physical mechanism of increase in Seebeck coefficient and decrease of that in 30min sample should be described.** **3. It is difficult to determine Seebeck coefficient value**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	owing to the significant noise in Seebeck signal as shown in Fig. 6. The method to define Seebeck coefficient value should be described in the manuscript. **In summary, an improved version of the paper is required for publication.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Wooyoung Lee**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Material Science and Engineering, Yonsei University, Korea**