



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_5897
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Newton's Zero Order Caustic for Analysis and Measurement: Part I – Absorbance
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper is of interest to the readers and it is very well-written. The work was carried out with good analytical quality. Data interpretation and discussions are clear and meaningful. The work addresses an important issue. If possible, I would recommend letting a chemists go over the analytical method briefly and find out whether or not the data could be interpreted as done in the paper. Since it's worth to let other people know about the significant measurement equipment , I would be happy to see the paper in revised form only if the aforementioned point is taken care of.	We thank the reviewer for the favourable comments. The second comment may have been addressed in the review process, but we do not know who reviewed the manuscript. However, we can summarize that Reviewer 3 had no problems with the analytical method and suggest minor grammatical changes. Reviewer 1 also did not find any problem with the way the data were interpreted. Our closing comment is that this manuscript is Part I of a three part series of studies that explores absorbance, fluorescence, and light scattering. All three manuscripts were all deemed accepted with minor reviews, and one manuscript is already in galley proof form. Our data interpretation, especially weakly versus strongly fluorescent analytes, and the way that the light is concentrated into an optical caustic within the sample has been compelling to a wider set of reviewers



SDI Review Form 1.6

		than would be the case with a single manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		