



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_11703
Title of the Manuscript:	The Electron Transfer Reaction of 3,7-Bis(dimethylamino)phenazothionium Chloride with Benzenethiol in Aqueous Nitric Acid: A Mechanistic Approach
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Specific purpose of the investigation of the kinetics of the electron transfer reaction of methylene blue (which is well known during many decades) with benzenethiol in aqueous solution in the range $0.3 \leq [\text{H}^+] \leq 0.9$ mole dm^{-3} at different ionic strength should be formulated very clearly in the Introduction. In another case it looks like a student's practical laboratory work. More than a half of the references are references on publications in very local journals, Ph.D. thesis's, and local conferences.	It is not true, literature on the kinetics of oxidation of redox dynamics of methylene blue is rather scanty, this is our attraction for embarking on the investigation. It is not a student's laboratory work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript looks like a report on a student's practical laboratory work. No real attempts to study the actual reaction mechanism by any modern experimental methods were undertaken.	We don't agree with this observation as the reviewer assertion is not true