



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_44596
Title of the Manuscript:	POLAROGRAPHIC AND VOLTAMMETRIC INVESTIGATION OF SUDAN I
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	<p>1. It is expedient to present references, which include other methods of Sudan I determination (HPLC, GC-MS, capillary electrophoresis), as mentioned in the manuscript (Introduction, paragraph 2). Particularly detailed information must be included about electrochemical methods published earlier (what techniques were used, electrodes, analytical characteristics etc.).</p> <p>2. The investigated mechanism by manuscript's Authors does not present anything new. Why did not Authors cite the primary source [Latimer G.W. Talanta 1968; 15:1 // Florence T.M. Australian Journal of Chemistry 1965;18(5):609–18.]? These authors were the first who proposed this mechanism of azo dye reduction. In the text it was presented that 2 protons and 2 electrons take part in the reaction (Page 5). But then Authors claim that there are two stages of reduction with participation of 4 protons and 4 electrons. This is not in agreement with the shape of voltammograms. No voltammograms have the shape with two stages of reduction. I cannot understand why Authors inserted such large Scheme 2, if the mechanism in acidic and basic media is the same and it was known long ago.</p> <p>3. Why did not Authors present any analytical characteristics of Sudan I determination, particularly LOD and LOQ? Is such approach available to quantitation of this azo dye in foodstuff, for example to detect falsification? This must be added, in other case this work does not have any worth.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Abstract does not contain any clear and concise information. Authors only describe what kinds of research they have done. The clear results must be presented in the Abstract as the work is a Research Paper.</p> <p>2. Previously, a significant effect of ethanol on the reduction of azo-dye was reported [Talanta 2001;54:221–31.]. Does 50% of ethanol content affect the recovery mechanism?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liliya Dubenska</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ivan Franko National University of L'viv, Ukraine</i>