



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12416
Title of the Manuscript:	LIFESPAN OF ASPILIA AFRICANA DYE SENSITISED SOLAR CELL USING BENZOIC ACID.
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 <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	1. There are wrong/imprecise statements such as on page 1, line 10, benzoic acid was added to the solar cells and on page 2, line 48, Aspilia Africana and benzoic acid as DSSC. Rephrase these sentences. 2. The English must be improved. Past tense & space between words. For example, on page 1: counter electrode and on page 2, was used. 3. Reference Lapornik B. et. 2007 or 2005? In the text, it is stated 2007 but in the list of references, it is written 2005. Ref. [3,5] were not cited in the text. 4. Refer to the table that illustrates the photovoltaic parameters. Why the power conversion efficiencies are very low and should not be reported. I think that this efficiency can be achieved by the solar cell without dye. The cell performance without dye was not presented so that we can observe the effect of dye on the cell performance. I_{sc} should be changed to J_{sc}. 5. Merge Figure 1 and 2 in a figure to make comparison. 6. Combine Figure 3,4,5,6,7 and 8 in a figure to make comparison. 7. Fig. 9 and its table are unclear. Improve the quality of the figure and the table.	The corrections were done. The efficiency observed was between a solar cell with dye only and another solar cell whose dye has been mixed with benzoic acid but the remark was noted. Thank you for the review.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		