

Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number MSB-D-22-01712

Novel study of wet chemical etching response of multi-crystalline Silicon wafers

Original Submission  
Enrique Quiroga-González, Ph.D. **Reviewer 1**

[Back](#) [Edit Review](#) [Print](#) [Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)

**Recommendation:** Major Revision **Overall Manuscript Rating (1 - 100):** 70

Transfer Authorization

If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have your consent to share your full review with the receiving journal Editor(s)?  
  
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have consent to share your identity with the receiving journal Editor(s)?

Response

Yes  
  
No

Custom Review Question(s):

By accepting this invitation, you agree that you have complied with the [Reviewer Guidelines](#).  
  
Please note that this journal is part of a journal ecosystem that allows authors of rejected manuscripts to transfer their manuscript and referee reports to alternative journals published by Elsevier. You will be given the option of permitting your unabridged comments and identity to be automatically transferred as part of this process: we kindly suggest that you permit this to avoid duplication of your efforts. Your identity will not be disclosed to authors, and remains confidential to journal Editors.

Response

I permit my report and identity to be transferred to other journals published by Elsevier as part of an Article Transfer scheme.

Manuscript Rating Question(s):

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see [www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts](#).  
  
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see [www.elsevier.com/highlights](#).

Scale Rating

	[1-3]	N/A
	[1-3]	2
Novelty and innovation of the work	[1-10]	3
Relevance to materials science and engineering	[1-10]	3
Overall quality and completeness of the work	[1-10]	5
Appropriate referencing	[1-10]	4
Overall manuscript rating	[1-10]	5

Reviewer Comments to Author

The topic is of interest for people working with texturization of surfaces. However, optimizing an etching procedure is not a strong proposal as a scientific paper. Here some comments or questions that could help to improve the paper. It is not acceptable for publication in its present state.  
1. Which are the concentrations of the etching solutions? you just provided the proportion between solutions in Table 1, but no information about their concentration was provided.  
2. It is desirable to have SEM micrographs with higher amplification. Figures 6, 7 and 8 are not helpful to describe how is the surface. Just in some cases it is possible to identify pyramids. Figure 6 was not used in the text.  
3. Could you please talk about reaction mechanisms in the manuscript?  
4. The axes of all the figures after figure 10 are not easy to read. It is difficult to follow the discussion about them.

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor:

Reviewers are required to enter their name, affiliation and e-mail address below. Please note this is for administrative purposes and will not be seen by the author.

Title (Prof./Dr./Mr./Mrs.): Prof. Dr.  
Name: Enrique Quiroga-González  
Affiliation: Institute of Physics, BUAP  
E-mail: equiroga@ieee.org

For each question, please use the following scale to answer (place an x in the space provided):

"To what extent does the article meet this criterion?"

- 0 Fails by a large amount  
1 Fails by a small amount  
2 Succeeds by a small amount  
3 Succeeds by a large amount  
4 Not applicable

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.

2

The information presented was new.

2

The conclusions were supported by the data.

2

Is there a financial or other conflict of interest between your work and that of the authors?

NO

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

-

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article:

The manuscript requires a major revision. It seems more a technical paper than a scientific paper; it handles optimization of a process. No much discussion is provided.



[Back](#) [Edit Review](#) [Print](#) [Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)

