



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_11517
Title of the Manuscript:	REDOX KINETICS AND MECHANISM OF THE OXIDATION OF THIOUREA BY DIAQUOTETRAKIS(2,2'-BIPYRIDINE) - μ - OXODIRUTHENIUM (III) ION, IN AQUEOUS PERCHLORIC ACID
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	1. Language issue: The revised ms should be proofread by a qualified colleague or a native English speaker before re-submission. 2. The more details of previous work should be provided in introduction. 3. Results and discussion lack details and need more extensive description and evaluation. Simply providing tables and figures is not enough. The authors should be point out specifically what are the key points, how they are different or similar to the previous work, and where is the innovation of this work. 4. Additional issues are listed below.	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Abstract: line 7, delete "Investigation of" 2. Line 9, done -> investigated 3. Line 14-18, unclear, need to revise the sentences 4. Line 34-36, give more details on the previous Work and point out the innovation of this work. 5. Figure 1, ratio of which/which 6. Eq 1 is not balanced. 7. Line 216, more details are needed. One sentence is not enough. 8. Line 218-219, more details are needed. Two sentences are not enough. 9. Line 225, a paragraph is needed to describe the proposed mechanisms, how many steps etc. 10. Line 290, delete "investigation of" 11. Line 291, carried out -> examined	
---	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harvey Hou
Department, University & Country	Department of Physical Sciences, Alabama State University, Montgomery, AL 36104, USA