



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_15350
Title of the Manuscript:	Relation between injection and transfer of CO ₂ and the pH of the medium
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	1. The authors should re-write the abstract to read more smoothly. 2. The authors should check the entire manuscript for subscript (such as CO₂, H₂O, and NaHCO₃). 3. The authors are suggested to have the manuscript edited for language.	Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In line 17, did the authors mean "air enriched with 12% CO₂ (v/v) was injected into the medium"? 2. In line 18, did the authors mean "at a flow rate of 0.05 l/min"? 3. Rephrase line 33 as "Correlation between theory and experiment". 4. In line 42, delete "which". 5. In line 43, replace "within" with "from". 6. In line 45, delete "that". 7. In line 71, did the authors mean "CT"? 8. In line 72, did the authors mean "and CO₂"? 9. In line 74, replace "as well as" with "and". 10. Line 79-83, the sentence is hard to read and understand. 11. In line 87, should be "in an open raceway bioreactor..." 12. In line 92, did the authors mean "sintered material pipe with nozzles"? 13. Line 117-122, the sentence is hard to read and understand.	1. OK 2. No, It is correct. 3. OK 4. OK 5. Ok 6. OK 7. OK 8. No. We mean the conversion of carbonate to CO₂ 9. OK 10. OK 11. OK 12. OK 13. OK



SDI Review Form 1.6

	14. In line 129, did the authors mean “ k_{La} ”? 15. In line 175, add comma after “rates”. 16. In line 177, add comma after “[1]”.	14. OK 15. OK 16. OK
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		