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.journalirjpac.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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Things added or needing change to make the procedure- results Clearer The structure of ESO does not appear on my download. 2.4: Some additional details about how the standard solutions were made would be useful here. There is little information about how the aliquots were made/ added. I assume the concentrations given are after dilution, but there is no way to check this with the information given. 3.1.2 The authors should state what criteria was used to select the best buffer? What is the basis for the % recovery in Table 2 and Table 4?	
Minor REVISION comments	There were some details about the experimental Procedure that I would like to see added 2.5.1 to 2.5.3. It would be helpful for tell what dilutions were done to bring the compound into the working range. 3.1.1 The authors show a nice linear calibration curve in Figure 2 that implies the working range for the dye. They then state "However; higher concentration of eosin Y was chosen for subsequent experiments." without explanation. They should state why this was done and why it was acceptable to do this. 3.1.5 It would be helpful to give the surfactant and its type in this paragraph. A statement why surfactants were tested would also be useful. These results indicate surfactants will affect the measurements.	
Optional/General comments	Possibel grammer changes The manuscript is generally well written, but I have made some suggested word changes **in bold red that I think are more grammatically correct.** 2.1. The first sentence seems to describe 3 things. It would be helpful to break this sentence into three sentences. Section 4: Remove EOS as forming a 1:1 complex as indicated in the text since the next sentence indicates it is 1:2 in agreement with the plot. The figures for EOS is the same as OMZ (except for the subscripts. Can the dimer structure of EOS be better presented?	

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:	**Tom De Vore**
Department, University & Country	**James Madison University, USA**