



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_13156
Title of the Manuscript:	Delayed Shifts in pH Responses to Weak Acids in Spring Water Exposed to Circular Rotating Magnetic Fields: A Narrow Band Intensity-Dependence
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 <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	The paragraph between the 157-164 lines should be rewritten and clarified; now the description of the procedure is rather confusing, may pose a problem to replicate.	We agree; as indicated in the revision (red print) we have rewritten and clarified the procedure. It should be much clearer now.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 171-172 (and other) - I believe that authors should use SI units in the whole paper (or Gauss, but I don't see the reason to use obsolete units). This way or another, authors should avoid using two different units (Gauss and Tesla) for the same physical value. Line 197, 299 - inconsistency in final pH value. Was it 3.4 or 4.4? Line 273 - word missing/ grammar error Line 286 – word missing/ grammar error	This is a style preference and we prefer both gauss and Tesla because there are still people who employ both. The grammatical check has been completed. The final pH has been specified.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 281 – equation 1 – it would look nice if made in less compact fashion The overall English grammar and spelling is good, but probably should be double-checked by native speaker. Especially the 'discussion' paragraph	Equation has been changed. Thank you for your suggestions; the manuscript has been read by a native (English) speaker.