



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) Authors do not indicate the medium used, if it was water it should be stated, but in any case, several considerations are made upon the medium preparation. There are fresh water microalgae and seawater microalgae, the transfer of CO₂ will rest on medium composition and also on the microalga growing there. Then as a first model it is OK to develop the model but it is useless for researchers as it is; applying this is not an option. 2) Authors should consider that a simple methodology was used; several model systems can be consulted on specialized journals. If authors decide to assay an specific medium and microalgae I may suggest for example <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> and Basal Bold Medium, which are the most common microalgal and medium for fresh water microalgae and offer a model with them, it would be more accurate and useful. It should be considered that dissolved salts in the medium affect the kLa of gases, as well as the agitation velocity, pH, temperature, etc. In microalgal cultures in open race bioreactors (which is the present model) there are several considerations on water flow to avoid, e.g. microalgal rupture. 3) Authors have modelled CO₂ transfer rate, I assume using water, and the initial pH is not stated. 4) There is a lack of information that make impossible to	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	repeat the experiments, even when the methodologies are referenced, it is necessary a short description at least. 5) Authors should consider to work hard on projects before send them as research papers, the present work has many issues that must be attended before to be considered for publication.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Mexico