



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 <i>Acacia polyacantha</i> 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- The title is spelled incorrectly and does not represent the work. - The introduction is based on the description of A senegal and their exudate. The authors do not make a description of A. polyacantha. - No poses a clearly aim of the work. - In material and methods, not described the method for determination of % uronic acid - In the method of equivalent weight, does not describe the changes made to the method proposed by the Encyclopedia of Chemical Sciences 1996. - The "results and discussion" must be numbered 2.2. - The authors do not describe the statistical methods used and not made a statistical analysis of the data, which the authors can not assert that there are significant differences observed between the results. - The title of the table is incorrectly formulated. - The data are not discussed, only describes the results obtained, although compared with other authors, but does not specify the causes of the observed variations. - The work not possesses a clear conclusion.	It has been done the title spelling, description of A. polyacantha gum, aim(page 1 ,2). Determination of % uronic acid, equivalent weight(page 4) . - The "results is numbered 2.2.(page 5). - The statistical methods has done page 4. And significant differences observed between the results . The data are discussed(page 5) . - clear conclusion is done (page 7). -
Minor REVISION comments	- There are no clear paragraphs. - bibliographic citations are incorrectly raised at the text - I noticed some mistakes in the use of English - Data could have been presented in more number of tables or any kind of graphic. - No use updated bibliography.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion, this paper addresses an interesting topic, but there are significant flaws, so I think it should be reviewed again by the authors before publication.	