



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_33788
Title of the Manuscript:	Deposition of Silicon Films from Liquid Cyclopentasilane Precursors Using High Pressure Spray System
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/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	Author(s) should correct the mistakes in writing the chemical formula of cyclopentasilane and cyclohexasilane as written in the introduction. The following refs. were not cited in the text of the article: 13, 20. Also, refs. 21 – 38 were not reviewed. Why?	Cyclopentasilane: The original publications of Hengge and Co-workers are written in German. The original title of the publication is cited and there cyclopentasilane is written without "e" at the end. Ref. 13 – was an error - is now included. Ref. 20 – was an error - is now included. -The response to reviewer x the reference. But are now discussed, refs. 21 – 38 were not reviewed why? now 24-41: In case of ref. 24 and 25 method are used which are described in the cited papers. Refs 26-34 are papers which are used to identify the IR-Bands found in the experiments. These papers show all the bands found here. But we think, that some discrepancies in these papers should not be discussed here. Ref. 35 is method applied and described in this reference. Ref. 36 and 37 are papers where some further results are published in "gray" literature. Refs 38-41 are shortly addressed.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	As above	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, the paper is fine, however it appears the organisation of the paper is rather unconventional, however, this may be due to the nature of the research carried out. I am feeling the paper should explicitly indicate in the methodology such parameters that were investigated. Yes some parameters that were used were mentioned in the methodology; however, the measured ones were not indicated. In discussing result, author(s) also mentioned on methodologies used. I think discussion should just be on explaining results obtained, and how these align with other bodies of knowledge in the literature.	The Fraunhofer Institut für Chemische Technologie as part of the Fraunhofer Gesellschaft <a href="https://www.fraunhofer.de/">https://www.fraunhofer.de/</a> might be unconventional by its innovative results, but is member of the biggest research organisation for applied science in Europe. IVT is a small research institute specialized for thin film technologies, using excellent equipment and analytics and the ability of making difficult experimental setup. HR Khan and H Frey are experts in thin film technology and have recently (ref. 1) published a text book which was already well accepted in the community. Experimental parameters were described completely. Where reasonable, measured parameters were specified and results discussed.