



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_5829
Title of the Manuscript:	A Simple Spectrophotometric Method for the Determination of Trace Level of Cadmium in Real, Environmental, Biological, Tobacco, Fertilizer and Soil Samples Using 2/, 3, 4/, 5, 7-Pentahydroxyflavone
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	(1) I personally think that the introduction has to be re-written. The reason is there is no flow especially in the 1st paragraph in the intro section. Repetitive points were made in the 1st paragraph. Also, no full names (NAA, GF-AAS etc) are given on the instruments mentioned in the 2nd paragraph (line 55). Motivation or objectives are not clearly stated. (2) It appears to me that the authors recruited eight subjects with different conditions. Are the sample sizes enough to determine the cadmium content in blood or urine? How many subjects did the authors analysed for each stated illness/condition? (3) It is stated that five replicates were carried out during the analyses. However, did the samples taken from different spots in the same venue? I think this factor is rather crucial to show the robustness of this method. (4) The references are not up to date. The latest reference was in 2004 (Line 675). What is the latest publications concerning this method?	(1) The Introduction has been re-written according to the suggestions made by the Reviewer (e.g. 1st & 2nd paragraphs). (2) Yes, sample size enough for blood & urine samples, five subjects analyzed for each illness/condition. (3) Yes, samples were taken from different spots in the same venue, which was mentioned in the text. (4) The more recent References have been incorporated in the Text accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 42: causes Line 58: What do you mean by "the instruments used in the routine analysis? The sentence is a bit hanging. Line 59: AAS often lacks of sensitivity,...	All the Typographical mistakes have been corrected and incorporated in the Text and marked in Red colour according to the suggestions made by the Reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 113:...were used throughout <u>the experiment</u>. Line 256: 50±2 % (v/v) – how do you calculate this? It is not properly stated in the graph or in your text. Line 398-399: omit the spacing at the end of sentence and delete one of the full stops. Fig. 7: Show clearly on your graph how you get the ratio of 1:2. Line 454: 20% <u>spacing</u> sulphuric Line 487: cooled Line 524: Stahr [30] <u>omit spacing</u>. Line 533: line spacing for a new paragraph.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, this draft is ok. The draft studied effects on different parameters (solvents, acidity, temperatures etc) of the proposed/developed method. The method was then applied to determine the trace level of cadmium in biological, environmental and so on. I could observe great effort was put by the authors to collect samples and analysed them. However, the data and results acquired mainly to proof the versatility of the proposed method and not much in-depth discussion was carried out. In my personal view, it will be more interesting to see more discussion in this draft rather than just many data collections. Did the samples such as blood and urine taken with the subject's consents? No statement such as clinical consent is stated in the text.	<i>More discussion has been incorporated in the text in each application according to the suggestions made by the Reviewer, which was indicated by red colour.</i> <i>Yes, clinical consent was taken from each subject which has been incorporated in the Text accordingly.</i>