SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOPACS_49809**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Enhancement of solar cell efficiency by using TiO2 nanostructure doped Fe2O3 dye and effect of concentration of solvent on optical properties**
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)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reformat the document** **I do not see an 'intercept' in Figs. 7-11** **How were Figs 12 and 13 measured?** **The ABSTRACT has still written there "(ARIAL, BOLD, 11 font … CAPS)" (which, by the way, the instructions the authors did not follow!)**	1/ **The document has been reformatted.** **2/ The Figs. 7-11indicate a change in the E_g of 5.5 before doped to(3.9 , 3.81 , 3.887and 3.818) eV after doped at different concentration. Since the change in E_g between sample before doped and first sample after doped at 1.1Con mol/l was very clear but change in E_g between all the sample after doped at different is very little because the different in Con also is little.** **3/ Figs 12 show the refractive index which is a function in the extinction coefficient and is measured by the equation 4. Fig. 13 is illustrated and measured by equation 5, which includes absorption and concentration.** **4/ The extract has been properly processed**
Minor REVISION comments	All value seperated from the unit. So, "1.5 mg" instead of "1.5mg", etc. All equations numbered. Where does last equation come from?	**1/ The appropriate distance between the number and the unit is all placed who to continent this.** **2/ All equations were numbered from 1 to 5**
Optional/General comments	The contents of the manuscript are of enough quality to warrant its publication. However, the format is really terrible! The document was written with very little care. (Why should anyone waste time on reading it when it was wriitten with disrespect for the reader?) The figures are incomprehensible and a lot of typos and erros are in the document. It ranges from small things (like writing sometimes "DSC" and sometimes "DSSC") to bigger things (like equations that are incorrect). They are too numerous to point them all out here.	**Thank you very much for this opinion, which I am very happy and increased my enthusiasm and I promise you more development and diligence in the coming Times.**

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	