

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_87041
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Omeprazole, Esomeprazole and Pantoprazole by Quenching the fluorescence of Eosin Y
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>)

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)
Fluorescence intensity (AF)	<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>Experimental part</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to add the reference substances OMZ, ESO and PAZ with their purities (Point: 2.2. Page 2 line 35) Specify the volume in ml of the solution of OMZ, ESO and PAZ used (At point 2.4. Page 3 line 6) 2.5.1. The temperature of the water bath treatment for 5min is not specified (Point: 2.5.1. Page 3 line 19) <p>Result</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The excitation wavelength must be the same everywhere, In all the paper the excitation is at 352nm, except for the results part it becomes 350nm. Even if the difference between the two figures is not big, it must be the same everywhere. (Item: 3. Page 3 line 36) Uniform legend presentation in Figures 1, 3-6 as an example Point: 3.1 Effect of reaction variables can be replaced by optimization of reaction conditions Compared to the temperature, the results are not presented (Point: 3.1.4 Page 5 line 24) Validation approach is not well elucidated() In a comment, it is said that the method is selective, this should not be said for this case because there is no result which demonstrates it. The interference study has not or is not the subject of the results available in this paper. (Item: 3.3. Page 8 line 40) With respect to the application of the method in analysis, Table 3: Origins of pharmaceutical preparations , contains the compagny . . (Item: 3.3. Page 9) . This is a statement that should not appear. Point 4. Pages 11 stoichiometries: this point must come just after optimization before linearity The discussion should be more referenced. The references are almost all in the introduction 	
	Minor REVISION comments	
	Optional/General comments	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Serigne Omar Sarr
Department, University & Country	Cheikh Anta Diop University, Senegal