



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47569
Title of the Manuscript:	FABRICATION OF TiO₂/DYE-SENSITIZED SOLAR CELLS (DSCs) USING DYE EXTRACTS AND THEIR MIXTURE AS PHOTSENSITIZERS
Type of the Article	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Minor revision suggested: Authors have reported an investigation on <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> and <i>Delonix regia</i> dye extracts and their mixture as natural sensitizers for $TiO_2/DSCs$. In general this manuscript is written lucid and well structured. Thus, it is commendable of publication in the current journal of applied science and technology. I have gone through manuscript and found that, the work is admirable but before acceptance for publications following corrections should be incorporated;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ The text in Figure 1 (a) is not clearly readable. Need to improve it. ✚ Figure 2 and 3: need to furnish all borders to looks reasonably. ✚ As I found that there are some latest citations (2018) are needed for the dye sensitized solar cells; for instant, New J. Chem., 2018, 42, 12024—12031; Journal of Photochemistry & Photobiology A: Chemistry 363 (2018) 1–6; New J. Chem., 2018, 42, 6990—6996; Organic Electronics 56 (2018) 232–239; Organic Electronics 53 (2018) 280–286; Organic Electronics 56 (2018) 260–267; Organic Electronics 48 (2017) 291-297. 	<p>The suggested corrections by the reviewer have been noted and have been effected as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Figure 1(a) has been made bold and as such is now very clear. It has also been highlighted in the revised manuscript ✚ For Figures 2 and 3, borders have been introduced. It has also been highlighted in the revised manuscript. ✚ As for the suggested latest citations, I have gone through them and I found them not relevant for our current research. But future research endeavours, they would be useful.
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>