

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_123972
Title of the Manuscript:	Modification of Lead-based perovskite solar cells using Tin compounds and how it Influences the overall efficiency
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is rich in information on various aspects of tin-based perovskite films and solar cells based on these films. which makes for enjoyable reading.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title doesn't quite match the content, and could be more precise	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is devoid of numerical results showing any improvement due to the revised techniques.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is good, the subsections are well explained but too long and contain a lot of repetition.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically well-crafted, and most of the problems faced by this type of structure and tin based perovskite materials are mentioned, along with the corresponding solutions. however, the contribution of simulation work is not mentioned, even though it provides important clarifications on which experimentation can build.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	references are adequate; suggested references : DOI: 10.1016/j.jer.2023.09.030 DOI: 10.1515/arh-2022-0138	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hayat Arbouz
Department, University & Country	Blida1 University, Algeria