



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_8043
Title of the Manuscript:	A Sequential Determination for the Arsenic Species in Fish and Honey Samples by Cloud-Point Extraction Coupled with Hydride Generation Atomic Absorption Spectrometry
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	(A) CPE is considered as environmentally-friendly but do not forget that alkylphenol ethoxylates, such as Triton X114, yield ecotoxic metabolites (see for instance Chem. Rev. 1997, 97, 3247-3272). (B) The average formula of TX-114 and some details on its clouding behaviour should be recalled. (C) The authors should insist on the specificity of the complexation, i.e. each chelating agent is only able to complex one As species.	(A) your comment is the right thing to do, there is no person can ignore the effect of degradation products of such surfactants to the aquatic environment and this is demonstrated by massive studies in this area. But naming the cloud point extraction method as environmentally- friendly came as a result of an agreement between all researchers in this field for the following reasons; 1- Although these surfactants are not always innocuous , but at least the CPE method offers a lower toxicity for the analysts and environment than some classical extraction methods which use a relatively toxic organic solvents in a large amounts . 2- The possibility of automation of CPE procedure may increase the green character for this technique. 3- CPE methods use a little amounts of surfactants and their discharge to environment is negligible compared to their use at thousands tons in industry alone not to mention the domestic uses. (B) it was reported in text in paragraph 2.2 , but the clouding behavior of TX-114 depends on various parameters such as electrolytes, non-electrolytes ,organic substances etc and this is outside the scope of the study. (C) It was confirmed that in the amended title of manuscript, In conclusions part 3.5 and in last paragraph of introduction.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please explicit all the acronyms the first time they are used, even WHO and FAO, especially in Table 3. Please check grammar and style throughout the paper: e.g. Abstract: "...enrichment factors...established method..." Introduction: l.22, "...70 times higher that of the methylated..."; l.25, "...ingested, due to enzyme activity inhibition [3,4]."; l.27, "...exposure to this element,..."; l.34, "...from the point of view of health impact, to obtain... in its different oxidation states."; l.38, procedures are needed..."; l.42, "...ion exchange..."; l.44-47 (sentence not understandable); l.54, "...was the extraction and determination of only one As species, while the other species was found by subtraction." l.57, "...will avoid the use of other methods..."; l.62, "...benzothizolylazo)..." etc.	All these amendments and suggestions have been carried out in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		