



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are some abbreviations that should be written fully when starting to use them Eg. "WHO", "FAO" Line 48: The authors should explain shortly what cloud point extraction is Line 51: I fully agree with all the advantages of cloud point extraction, but the authors should give links to recent or related papers. Include some extra references please. Line 123: the results of the CHN analysis are deviating from the expected values. Is this due to side products or impure starting products? Could the authors comment on this? Line 199: is this the pH before or after the extraction? Could the authors add this to the manuscript. Can the authors shortly add more info about how they changed the pH here.	All these suggestions have been carried out in the text. The short definition of CPE was introduced in paragraph 1 (i.e. in introduction). We included ref.28 and 29 and other references are arranged accordingly. Due to side products plus the amount of O was not determined for the prepared reagent. So we can expect it is about >97% if the oxygen measured. The solution pH should be adjusted before extraction process in order to ensure the formation of hydrophobic complex between analyte and chelating agent which can be easily entrapped into micelles of nonionic surfactant. This is clear in the description of the general procedure for CPE (2.4) .
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There are some spaces and punctuation marks in the manuscript which should not be there. This makes the manuscript looking like it was written to fast. Line 102: The <u>sock</u> complexing agent solutions. Line 134: what is "10 C"? Line 176: 40 0C should be 40 °C	Amendment in the text Corrected in the text It is 10 °C under arrow and the figure was amended as shown in the text Yes 40 °C , corrected in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		