



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	Research

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. A lot of work related to the photocatalytic degradation of pollutants using TiO_2 as a photocatalyst has been reported in the literature. However, in the present paper authors are reporting TiO_2 as a photosensitizer or adsorbent, which is absolutely incorrect nomenclature. In the process of degradation (by oxidation), TiO_2 works as photocatalyst and not as sensitizer. Therefore, title itself, of the study is not appropriate. 2. It is not clear how the progress of the reaction has been monitored. Whether it is through spectrophotometric technique or analyzing the kinetics of adsorption. The authors should make it clear and correct. 3. Why λ_{max} 260 nm has been selected for preparing the calibration curve. 4. The paper is full of spelling mistakes and	The title Corrected. Spectrophotometry It's the most clear effected by light . Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	improper sentences. Presentation is also not up to the mark. The manuscript should be thoroughly reviewed by some english expert before it is submitted to any journal for publication. 5. Some of the mistakes are synsityzer (sensitizer), precideu (pseudo), natural (neutral), PH (pH), c (°C), conce (conc), TiO2 (TiO₂), ml (mL), degredation (degradation), larg (large), media (medium) and many many more. Those given in bracket is correct. 6. Figure numbers given in the text and as a caption below the figures does not match. 7. In the introduction objective is not clear. The authors should make it more clear comparing their work with earlier reported work.	Corrected. Corrected. The objective is clear , removing of the pollutant material experimentally and theoretically
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		