

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3474
Title of the Manuscript:	Buffer Standards for Physiological pH of the Buffer N-(2-Acetamido)-2-aminoethanesulfonic Acid from 5°C to 55°C
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Physiological Buffers are relevant and are subject to change based on alterations in temperature and other physical parameters which are relevant to mechanism of action or recreations of chemical compounds in Labs for their practical application from chemical Engineering to Pharmacology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title seems like an identical replica of a prior article titled " Buffer Standards for pH Measurement of N-(2-Hydroxyethyl)piperazine-N'-2-ethanesulfonic Acid (HEPES) for $I=0.16 \text{ mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ from 5 to 55 °C " or " Buffer Standards for the Physiological pH of the Zwitterionic Compound, ACES from 5 to 55°C " with change in Chemical name. Both article do not express very much regarding the contents of the paper Adv change to "Quantitative analysis of Buffer standard for physiological pH of N-(2-Acetamido)-2-aminoethanesulfonic Acid from 5 °C to 55°C."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract as such is quite methodical to the point, however since it is for a book chapter inclusion of a rationale as to why temperature affects pH or reason for selection for ACE in the current study?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, No change warranted	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Everything is subject to change in science including chemical used as a physiological pH buffers thus there is a need to standardise a secondary/ tertiary standard reference solution for pH measurements which may have some superior physical traits to replace the current "Gold standard" in clinical application/research. Theory seems quite accurate to the best of my knowledge but to adv review with a Chemical Engineer for numeric accuracy of values.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	New Reference are limited, however considering the scientific specificity of the topic there is a chance that 2009/2010/2011 was that last time such elaborate work was done on the same field. No change warranted	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes , No change warranted	
Optional/General comments	Kindly add a legend below every table for shortforms or acronyms used within the table 1 to 5 except table 6 which is self explanatory as it suggests a very lazy style of writing.	

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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siddharth Narayan
Department, University & Country	Saveethe Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India