Response to Reviewer Comments

**Point 1:** Although I questioned about using the acronym and suggested using the full work in 1st review, repeated use of long words throughout the paper seems inefficient, such as "monocrystalline silicon wafers" or "monocrystalline silicon solar cells". I would like to suggest the author use the word "the solar cells" or "the silicon cells" or "the wafers" if the author used the same wafer throughout the study. (Unless your results do not include multicrystalline silicon wafer, I think there's no need to mention "monocrystalline silicon" repeatedly. It would be good to mention the word, "monocrystalline silicon" only once in the beginning.)

**Response 1:** We followed the suggestions. "monocrystalline silicon wafers" and "monocrystalline silicon solar cells" have been replaced by "the wafers" and "the silicon cells" in the revised paper.

**Point 2:** I would like to suggest the author include the original I-V curve graph of the best-efficiency solar cell.

**Response 2:** We followed the suggestions. The original I-V curve graph of the best-efficiency solar cell have been added in the revised paper.

**Point 3:** Fig. 9, Fig. 10, and Fig. 12: As $I_{SC}$ is determined by the size of silicon solar cells, I would like to suggest the use of parameter, $J_{SC}$. ($J_{sc}$ is not a function of cell size, thus it would be more appropriate to use the parameter of $J_{SC}$ instead of $I_{SC}$)

**Response 3:** We followed the suggestions. Indeed, it would be more appropriate to use the parameter of $J_{SC}$ instead of $I_{SC}$. In the revised paper, Fig. 9, Fig. 10, and Fig. 12 are improved, in which the parameter $J_{SC}$ is used.
Also, the English language and style have been checked carefully. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.