



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_13680
Title of the Manuscript:	AN OVERVIEW OF ARSENIC EXTRACTION AND SPECIATION TECHNIQUES IN SOIL AND WATER
Type of the Article	Review 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	The manuscript pretends to be a review article, but it is a simple overview of an interesting theme. A review article must be a comprehensive synthesis of relevant works with the most relevant contributions and innovations in one update research theme. This work should be rejected because is too short as review article and its contribution is completely irrelevant for most researchers working in this area. The mere compilation of references (which is extensive, but not enough updated) using trivial of cited articles (e.g., see p.1 line 28, reference [4]) or partial sentences as a citation (e.g., p3, line 139, for reference [47] is not the correct way to perform a true review article, which needs also a careful, critical and thorough integrative analysis. Therefore, the contents of this article are already well described in several books and scientific literature available all over the world (e.g. "IBEROARSEN-Metodologías analíticas para la determinación y especiación de arsénico en aguas y suelos", ed. M.I. Litter, M.A. Armienta, S.S. Faría) minimizing its contribution and interest.	We improved the article and tried to make it more comprehensive and also updated the references. Thank you for your suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		