



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15628
Title of the Manuscript:	BASE DOPING AND ILLUMINATION LEVEL EFFECTS ON A BIFACIAL SILICON SOLAR CELL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 25 ...back surface field (BSF) Line 37 phenomena not phenomenon Line 48 lifetime (tau) and not T Line 50 Equations 5 may read (5a), (5b) and (5c) (n rear) and not (n back) Line 53 Coefficients am and bm are tabulated values. Where is the table? RESULTS AND DISCUSSION What simulation technique or package did you use? Line 87..... it provides Line 97..... with the presence of a back surface field (BSF) Line 102 thinner base will be better. Lines 145, 146 and 147 (shed more light on this claim) Line 148 and 149 ...recast this statement clearly.	Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text The values of coefficients have been taken from [6] All the equations have been computed with Mathcad software. Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text Yes, corrected in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is O.K in this form if the highlighted comments are taken care of.	