Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IRJPAC_122159**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Research Development and Future Aspects of Quantum dot and Perovskite Sensitized Solar Cells**
Type of the Article	**Minireview Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**I reviewed the article. It explained the historical context, current development, advantages and future research trends of quantum dot and perovskite sensitized solar cells.** **1. The article covers an extensive range of topics related to quantum dot and perovskite sensitized solar cells. However, the structure could be improved by organizing the content into more distinct sections. For example, the historical background could be separated from the technical discussion, and the mechanisms of the two types of solar cells could be presented in a more parallel format for easier comparison.** **2. There is some inconsistency in the use of terminology throughout the article, particularly with regard to abbreviations and technical terms (e.g., "QDSSCs," "PSSCs," "quantum dots," "perovskite"). This could lead to confusion for readers who are not experts in the field.** **3. While the article provides a good overview, some sections, particularly those on the mechanisms of the solar cells, could benefit from deeper analysis. The discussion of quantum confinement and the multiple exciton generation (MEG) in quantum dots, as well as the role of different materials in perovskite solar cells, could be expanded.** **4. The references used in the article are mostly adequate, but there are instances where the sources are either outdated or not the most authoritative available. The field of solar cell research is rapidly evolving, and it is important to use the most current and relevant literature.** **5. There are several grammatical errors and awkward phrases throughout the article that could detract from its professionalism and readability. For example, phrases like "regarding to fulfill our energy demand" and "by the use of double perovskite" could be revised for clarity and correctness.**	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sijo Francis**
Department, University & Country	**St. Joseph's College, India**