



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_47990
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Ionic Activity Coefficient of ionic salt on Demulsification of soy Lecithin Oil-Water Emulsion
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Title</b> 1) Kindly check the title again with possibility of reframing it. Do you mean lecithin oil-water emulsion, soybean based lecithin oil-water emulsion, or soybean oil-water emulsion? This distinction becomes important as it will guide abstract and methods/procedures	It is modified
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Abstract</b> 1) Abbreviations are defined in their first usages (line 7) 2) "a lot of scope' is too vague (line 7). Please recap. 3) O-W or O/W (line 7 and others). Be consistent. 4) " the proposed work ..." (line 8 & 9). Which work? Be specific. 5) "The experiment was aimed..." (line 10). Which experiment? Be specific. 6) Represent pH (line 14 and others) as it should. 7) Does ionic activity coefficient have unit? (line 13). Please check. 8) "Thus, the overall observations...( line 22-26). Which observations? Be specific  <b>Introduction</b> 1) The leading sentence (line 31 & 32) is ambiguous. Applicable also to statement credited to reference no.1. (line 35 & 36) 2) What does " mM" (line 40 & 41) mean? 3) "The above cited...(line 78)?? 4) Move line 93-95 to the appropriate section (discussion)  <b>Materials and methods</b> 1) No reference cited in the whole of this section?? 2) " All the chemicals were purchased from Merck suppliers" could suite line 99 & 100. 3) Unit of weight?? (line 102). And do you mean soybean seed? Check other lines 4) Soxhlet?? (line 103). Also LR?? Do you mean n-hexane? 5) Sampling?? (line 109). Emulsion preparation detailed in Table 1 does not fit the heading used. How do the inorganic compounds relate with other parameters of Table 1?? 6) Kindly specify the amount used against V/V or V/W (line 115-117). 7) The colloidal emulsion was allowed to stand at 25-28°C. (line 119). How long?? 8) ... were allowed to stand over a time period (line 121). How long? Please specify. 9) What is "double distilled water"? (line128). 10) Line 128-130 is ambiguous. Also, can dissolution of any salt in 100 ml of distilled water give 0.001M of the salt solution?? 11) Double check the unit in line 132. Also details of line 133 are necessary.  <b>Results and discussion</b> 1) Is there no any work in this area? Results obtained in this work should be compared with other similar scholarly works and any notable variation should be adequately accounted for.  <b>Conclusion</b>	Corrected according to the reviewer suggestions and references were cited.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	1) Conclusion should dwell more on whether the objective of this work had been achieved, and make useful suggestion if there is need to explore other methods in achieving the stated objective.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	1) Pay attention to details especially in the materials and methods section. Also cite references where applicable. 2) A thorough review of similar scholarly works on the subject area and incorporating them in the discussion section will enrich this manuscript.	References were cited. The manuscript has been corrected according to the suggestions given by the reviewer. The authors are thankful to the reviewer's suggestions to enrich the article

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues