



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_25295</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Photoelectrochemical Performance of a dye sensitized solar cells based on natural pigments with distilled water as extracting solvent.</b>
Type of Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The most important issue is that the authors didn't considered all the indicated comments. From this reason the manuscript needs to be improved. The value of the manuscript cannot be increased by giving superficial responses to the comments, without including supplementary indicated results.</p> <p><b>My specific comments are:</b></p> <p><b>1. Authors should mention exactly the page and line were they have included the responses to the reviewer comments. This is available for all the comments. For example: response to comment 13: ". The fill factor measures the ideality of the device and is defined as the ratio of the maximum power output per unit area to the product of Voc and Jsc Which is clearly analysed in the text and eqn. 1" Where is mentioned the above paragraph in the text??????</b></p> <p><b>2. Authors should request the permission to the authors of ref.[5] to include Fig. 1 in their manuscript. This must be clearly written in the Fig name. (...with permission of ref. [5]).</b></p> <p><b>3. All the results must be given for all the 4 samples and for the reference (cell without sensibilizer).</b></p> <p><b>4. Fig. 3.2 must be discussed from the chemical point of view (reactions occurring,</b></p>	<p>Thank you for your comments below are my responses.</p> <p><b>1. the equation 1, in line 188 clearly defined the fill factor.</b></p> <p><b>2. I don't undastand your statement by saying I should request for the permission of the author of ref[5], didn't I acknowledge the author's work?</b></p> <p><b>3. please did the reviewer actually carefully reviewed this work? Table 1 in line 210, Fig. 3.1 in line 158, fig 3.2 in line 164 gave the details of the comparative work. Its also important for the reviewer to note that I am dealing with the visible region in my research which is shown in the UV-vis spec. the dye is the antenna which trap sunlight so without the sensitizer, you cant get any response with the simulator and besides when DSSC is without sensitizer, it means you'll have to work at the ultraviolet region which which</b></p>



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

<p>etc...)</p> <p>5. Table 1 - values for reference must be included</p> <p>6. the mechanism for each type of cell must be illustrated and discussed.</p>	<p>means there cannot be generation of excitons. Thanks</p> <p>4. how do you mean by Fig. 3.2 should be discussed in chemical point of view? Fig 3.2 shows the solar simulation results of various prepared DSSCs at light intensity of 100 mw/cm<sup>2</sup></p> <p>So I don't understand the chemical perspective here.</p> <p>5. it a comparative studies carried out with 4 different dye in DSSCs to investigate which of the dye response best in the presence of sunlight. So no reference cell without sensitizer. I really hope the reviewer understands what I mean here. Thanks</p> <p>6. they have the same working mechanism. they both have the same component and same principle of operation. The only difference is the sensitizers. Thanks.</p>
---	---