



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_7819
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrochemical Decolorization of Maxilon Red GRL Textile Dye
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 manuscript presents the decolorization of a dye by electrooxidation and electrocoagulation using different electrodic materials. The manuscript contains many important results, however, a critical comparison between the data obtained by EO and EC is missing. Some ideas or sentences are duplicated in the Introduction and Results. This reviewer thinks that 12 Figures is too much. In some Figures, the discussion text is not very clear and this description does not represent correctly the analytical data. Some recent references could be cited in the manuscript.	- The results presented for EO and EC could be compared from the figures contained in the paper. - Some new references were introduced.
Minor REVISION comments	Are there papers in the literature dealing with the discoloration of dyes by these two techniques? EO: In some points, why the authors use 2 and/or 4 g L⁻¹ of NaCl, since 4 g L⁻¹ was better for the dye decolorization? Is it possible to calculate the energy consumption by the two processes? Fig. 8: Color removal percentage is higher for NaCl 3 g L⁻¹ than 4 g L⁻¹. Have the authors some explanation? Page 12: in the sentence "So, from the Fig. 9, it can be concluded that the optimum pH values appeared between 7 and 9 which will provide an economical and effective treatment for the dye solution in practical". Please, could the authors explain this sentence, since the results at pH 5 was very similar to the others pH values? References 31 and 32 are not described in the list at the end of the manuscript.	- The values of NaCl were corrected in the figures. - The sentence was corrected. - References 31 and 32 were described.
Optional/General comments	-----	