

Manuscript: “**Characterization Analysis of Textured and Diffused Monocrystalline Silicon Wafer**”

Submitted: 28 December 2020

Accepted: 23 March 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Ashrafuzzaman Rubel

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p125

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Salloom A. Al-Juboori, Muta’h University, Jordan

Reviewer 2: M. Mofazzal Hossain, University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|---|--|
| Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Salloom A. Al-Juboori | Email: |
| University/Country: Mutah/ university/ Jordan | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 1/2/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 4/2/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Characterization of textured and diffused Monocrystalline Silicon wafer | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0125/21 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| Needs proof reading | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| Needs to clarify the practical applications of the final results | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 2 |
| All references are 2015 and older. Needs to consult recent references up to 2020 | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewer Name: M. Mofazzal Hossain | Email: |
| University/Country: University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 12 January 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 15 March 2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Characterization of textured and diffused Monocrystalline Silicon wafer | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0125/21 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 2 |
| <i>The title of the paper does not reflect the content of the paper. Authors should revise the title of the paper.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>The abstract should also need minor revision so that it reflects all the finding of the work.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>There are many grammatical errors. Authors should rigorously revise the manuscript.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>Authors tried to clearly explain their methods and experiment.</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>The results are clear and authors should give more explanation of the graphs.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>The conclusion is accurate except several grammatical error.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>The references are appropriate.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors carried out experiments on Si wafer based textured surface. They performed SEM and explained the merits of textured surface. However, before publication, authors should rigorously go through and revise the manuscript. There are several grammatical errors. Abstract and title should be revised.