



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	1. Too many typing mistakes and grammatical errors are included in the text, also in figure label. Therefore, your arguments in the manuscript cannot be recognized. Especially, in the result part of molecular-orbital calculations. <u>Please carefully correct the manuscript again.</u> 2. Details of molecular-orbital calculations are not described in "2. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS". 3. Technical terms are not uniformly used, for example, "Alizarin Red S", "Alizarin red-S", "Alizarine Red Sulfate" are mixed in the text. 3. Too long sentences are included in the text. For example, the 2nd sentence in "4. CONCLUSIONS" should be separate d to two parts. 4. The 1st sentence in "4. CONCLUSIONS" is not logical. If you describe such sentence, details of the calculation results and the experimental results should be written.	many typing mistakes and grammatical errors and all figures label Corrected. The figures showed the details Corrected. Corrected. Corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		