

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_96835
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrochemical determination of inorganic mercury (II) on a poly(Eriochrome blue black R) modified carbon paste electrode
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:

(<https://www.journalirpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/editorial-policy> )

### 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  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>It is a thorough investigation of the performance of a modified carbon electrode for mercury analysis. This is an important enough topic to generate some interest.</p> <p>Yes. The title explains what was done clearly.</p> <p>Yes. It gives all of the important findings. The lay-put makes sense to me. I would like to see an expanded presentation in the experimental section before answering this. The data presented indicates it is, but this assumes the concentrations presented were determined correctly. While I assume they were, I would need more information about how the solutions were made to confirm this. My recommendation is to add this information to the experimental section.</p> <p>The references are adequate. Adding a reference or two on the cause of the cyanide interference could be done.</p> <p>I have made suggestions for things to add in the manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I think that considerable editing is needed. I have made some suggestions that I think makes the manuscript easier to follow. The authors are free to accept or reject them as they choose.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>This is a complete through investigation of the performance of this electrode. Most of my suggestions are to include additional information. No other revisions are needed.</b>	

### PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thomas C De Vore
Department, University & Country	James Madison University, USA