



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15628
Title of the Manuscript:	BASE DOPING AND ILLUMINATION LEVEL EFFECTS ON A BIFACIAL SILICON SOLAR CELL
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I am through, I have issues with the reference and the method. There is no method section all I have is mathematical formula and results, can the author structure scientifically the methodology section?	Thank you for your review; The presented study is a theoretical one so that no experiment nor experimental results are presented. We first introduced our work (Introduction) and then presented the mathematical framework (Mathematical formulation) on which the study is based. In the third part, the simulation results are presented with discussion on three selected points: the photocurrent density, the bifaciality coefficient and the conversion efficiency. The work is then terminated by a resume of the study. For references, we used the author's guidelines for this journal.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--