

ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	JournalofPharmaceuticalResearchInternational
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JPRI_107610
TitleoftheManuscript:	SimultaneousAnalysisofTraceTetracyclinesinWastewaterwithUltra-HighPerformanceLiquidChromatographyCoupledwithMassSpectrometry
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearch Article

ReviewForm1.7

PART1:ReviewComments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. The study describes an improved method for the detection of tetracyclines in wastewater. This is of importance to the scientific community and regulatory agencies alike.</p> <p>Yes; the title accurately represents the subject matter of the article.</p> <p>Yes. The excessive use of abbreviations makes it a bit hard to follow though. Please see below.</p> <p>They are. The article was organized in a logical way and was quite easy for even a non-analytical chemist to follow.</p> <p>Absolutely. Proper statistical analysis was applied and the data is impressively precise. Please read and address below.</p> <p>The article needs a final and careful editing. The grammar is acceptable but needs improvement from a native speaker. The most persistent and annoying correction is a space between the text and the ref. It seems the reference software took these out in many places or it got lost in a file conversion. For example, this needs a ref [1] should not be this needs a ref [1].</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Noted above. It is but a careful reading by a native speaker would improve the article some. However, the grammar is not so poor it distracts from the science of the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This might be just a personal preference but the excess use of abbreviations made for an annoying read. There is no need to abbreviate tetracyclines and if done once it should be done throughout. The same is true for minocycline oxycline etc. A few of the analytic techniques were abbreviated without a definition obscuring the meaning from a non-expert. However, if these are such commonplace in the field the authors should ignore this comment.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kevin Francis
Department, University & Country	Texas A&M University, USA