



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_6299
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of Retention in Gradient Reversed-Phase Liquid Chromatography for <u>Phenylisothiocyanate-Derivatives</u> of Amino Acids
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	The manuscript is not well-written and contains many grammatical mistakes. The methodology is appropriate but is not described in sufficient detail. Amino acids are abbreviated in non-capital letters in table 1 and in capital letters in table 2 and figure 1. The axes labels in figures 2 and 3 are not distinct or clear.	Thank you for dedicated time of reviewing the manuscript. We took into account your comments and corrected the manuscript. 1. Manuscript was editing by American Manuscript Editors. The license is attached. 2. We decided do not change methodology, in our mind used equipments, software and chemicals are carefully described in our study. The sample preparation procedure is widely used. It is precisely described and is accessible in a lot of scientific literature. 3. The abbreviations of amino acids were corrected. All abbreviations in tables and figures were written in capital letters. 4. We corrected axes labels in figures 1, 2 and 3.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript describes a method for the determination of retention times using reversed phase liquid chromatography for derivatized amino acids. On the basis of the results obtained, the authors conclude that the solvatic retention model saves time and predicts retention times after a single experiment. In my opinion, the investigation is within the scope of the journal, but is very modest. The study would have been stronger if the authors tried to correlate retention times with one or more physical-chemical properties of the amino acids.	Thank you very much for your valuable advice and objective judgment. We will take it into account in our future study.