



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_29925
Title of the Manuscript:	Photochemical cell Yellow 5GN Conversion and Storage of Solar Cell
Type of the Article	Original Research papers

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript must be corrected, so many typing mistakes as lack in a good redaction exist. For example the aim of the study "is the effort to observe..." Results and discussion are not in accordance with the results, at the maximum dye concentration, parameters evaluated are decreased, without any explanation. All the results have the same behaviour, this means something important but the authors don't include any discussion about it.	Yes, I agree with reviewer comments. I changed manuscript according to the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References don't present a unique format, some of them contains the title in cursive, but not all, the use of capital letters at the beginning of the title is only in some cases, incomplete references also. No numbers in the tables	Yes, I agree with reviewer comments, I changed manuscript according to the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript seems to be written without any revision	No. I m not agree. I wrote manuscript according to my research work.

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

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>