



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_49808
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of annealing temperature on the optical properties of TiO <sub>2</sub> doped Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> dye dissolve in ethanol solvent
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	First of all, English language of the paper should be necessarily revised and improved. The title of the paper is not corresponds to the content. It is not clear how the samples were prepared. In Conclusions was written " This project is conducted to show that, the annealing of TiO <sub>2</sub> film can increase its efficiency in a DSSC." However, efficiency of solar cells was not studied, because the solar cells finally were not prepared. In this Paper only some parameters were studied, that only supposed to improve characteristics of solar cells. So, that the aim and conclusions should be reformulated.	1/ English language review and improvement 2/ Edit the title in accordance with the content. 3/ The method of work was reviewed and the samples were prepared. 4/ The conclusion were reviewed in accordance with the content and the results show that the temperature has reduced. This leads to the degree of heat that improves the optical properties
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The Introduction can be reduced and more concretized.	The introduction has been reduced
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)	