



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24437
Title of the Manuscript:	Photoelectric Characterization of Dye-Sensitized Solar Cells Using Natural Dye from roselle plant (hibiscus safdariffa) as Photosensitizer
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	1. I have got no any scientific name of roselle plant like hibiscus safdariffa. It should be <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>. 2. A paragraph about <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> should be included in the 'Introduction' part. 3. Absence of clarification in "Results and Discussion" paragraph. 4. References used in this paper are very old.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. 'Photovoltaic performance' does not demand to take a separate subtitle. It may be included at the last part of the 'Introduction'. 2. 'Experimental' section should be broadened by including subtitles (Materials, Extraction of natural dye, Separation of Dye, Preparation of TiO₂ electrode, Preparation of electrolyte and counter electrode, Assembling the cell, Characterization and measurement). 3. 'Characterization' may go into the subtitle 'Experimental' as 'Characterization and measurement' as stated above. 4. 'Results and discussion' should be broadened by including subtitles (Morphological analysis of TiO₂ powder, UV-VIS spectroscopy analysis, etc.) with sufficient clarification.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Total work volume in this paper is poor. 2. Although the writing language is suitable but the manuscript is not furnished properly. 3. Scientific name should be written in proper way.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sardar Muhammad Shauddin
Department, University & Country	Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology, Bangladesh