



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_11106
Title of the Manuscript:	Analytical data on acetone fractional precipitates of Acacia polyacantha gum
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction: The background of the study was written not bad. But, all of references sol old. The results of the manuscript should be discussing newer studies' results. The purpose of the article is not clearly stated. In this chapter, the sufficient literature data were given, however, they are so old. Methodology: Adequate. Literatures are so old Results: Not Adequate. Discussion: Not bad, but all literatures so old. So typographical errors were identified in the manuscript. These errors should be revised. The article should be checked in terms of literatures and language.	Introduction: It has been done, the new studies results is given in page1 and 2. The purpose of the article is clearly stated page 2 paragraph2 and the new litreture is done. It is the available methodology. Results: It has been adequate. Discussion: The literatures is renewed and the error in the manuscripts is revised in terms of literatures and language(page 5,6,7).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		