



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_10212
Title of the Manuscript:	Cation-Type Dependences of ^1H and ^{29}Si MAS NMR Chemical Shifts and Desorption Temperatures of Water Molecules in Faujasite-Type Zeolites
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	This manuscript deals with the study of Na ions in FAU with Si/Al ratios of 1.0, 1.2, 1.7, 2.4, and 3.5 exchanged by each Li, K, Rb, and Cs ions. High-resolution solid-state ¹ H NMR spectra with a magic-angle (MAS) method showed a signal which can be assigned to H atoms of water molecules adsorbed on each FAU. Based on ¹ H MAS NMR and TG-DTA results, the authors concluded that water molecules form weak hydrogen bonds in Na- and K-type FAU with high Si/Al ratios.	Thank you very much.
Minor REVISION comments	In my opinion this article could be accepted for publication in the International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry after a Minor REVISION , since there are many mistakes in typewrites it. For example in page 3 it is lacking many spaces between the words. I noticed these mistakes for all of the text.	I cannot understand why many spaces between words were deleted in the draft. I inserted appropriate spaces in the 2nd revision.
Optional/General comments	In my opinion, the authors described in a scientific methodological way the approach employed to obtain the results presented here that are relevant for the knowledge of this kind of research. The Authors discussed their results in an appropriated way and these led them to conclusions until now do not known. The references used allows to the readers to access the similar research developed by other groups. The results presented were compared with others in the scientific literature and are well discussed in this article.	Thank you very much.