



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_7662
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling of advanced photo oxidation of alizarin red s dye using TiO2 as synsityzer
Type of the 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 English of manuscript is too bad, there are lots of typing errors and badly constructed sentences. The English of manuscript must be revised. For example: In the title, line 3 .. as synstyzzer... should be corrected as as sensitizer In the abstract, the term of "photodegradation" should be corrected as photodegradation In the abstract, the term of "pecideu first order" should be corrected as pseudo first order Also sentence in abstract must be completed, the sentence is missing "Results from the experimental study.....aqueous media were. ??? In the introduction, the term of "textile dyeing" should be corrected. Line 49 again synsitizer??? Line 137 degradation?? Line 103 spectrophotometerically??? Manuscript must be carefully edited.	Corrected. Corrected. Corrected. Completed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Add the following reference in the introduction part. <i>"A. C. Cakir, P. Guloglu, M. Bilgin, S. Erten-Ela, Comparison of Randomly-oriented ZnO Nanorods and Butterfly-type ZnO Nanorod Bundles for Toluidine Blue Photocatalytic Degradation, JOURNAL of OPTOELECTRONICS and ADVANCED MATERIALS, Vol. 14, Issue 3-4, pp.230-237, 2012".</i> -Correct the Table, the term of This work in the table is not suitable. -Author did not explain pH effect in the ms. Could you explain the pH effect in the manuscript for experimental and theoric calculations. -Author should be added kinetic analysis results. -Author should be done TOC removal efficiency and decolorization efficiency experiment and should be discussed in Results and Discussion part. -Please revise the conclusion part according to results and discussion part.	Added. Added. Corrected. Added. Revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Major revision	