



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_39216
Title of the Manuscript:	Solubility of Benzoic Acid in Six Alcohols within (288.15 to 336.15) K and Thermodynamic Properties in the Dissolution Process
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>)

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. Equation 1 is so obvious and not necessary, also the solubility models in sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 should be minimized, the readers should be sent to references 14-17, published articles of the same authors, where they are very well explained. 2. Cheng, W. et al, Adv. Materials Res. 2012, 518-523, 3975-3979; Thati, J. J. Chem Eng. Data 2010, 55, 5124-5127; should be cited. 3. References are lack of uniformity (the point after the initial name is missing in refs. 3, 6), incomplete (in ref 7 the author name Jing Li is missing) of wrong (see refs. 1, 11, 20, 11 for the correct citing of authors names)	1. The equation 1 has been deleted and the solubility models in sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 has been minimized.. 2. The two references have been added in the revised manuscript. 3. References have been revised according to your suggestions.
Minor REVISION comments	In line 63 as well as in other parts of the manuscript, units should be written after an space from the values (20 g instead of 20g), line 72 (3 h instead of 3h), etc. Line 231 eq. 21 is mistaken.	Units have been written after an space from the value in the revised manuscript. Line 231 eq. 21 has been corrected.
Optional/General comments		