



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_ACSj_17636
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic Studies of Bio-sorption of Cyanide ions from Aqueous Solution using Shea Butter Seed Husk as Adsorbent
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>).



SDI 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	1- The adsorbent characterization is completely insufficient for the actual standards. SEM, FTIR, BET and point of zero charge were not provided. In this way it is not possible to prove the adsorbent characteristics. 2-Some of the models used are originally non linear, but the authors linearized, prejudicing the parameters estimation and the fit quality. 3- Only R^2 is not sufficient to verify the fit quality. at least one error analysis is necessary. 4- R^2 is coefficient of DETERMINATION. 5-The application and statements about the intraparticle diffusion model are completely wrong. Specific literature should be verified. 6-The present work is not about "biosorption". Is adsorption. The concept is confuse in this work.	SEM, FTIR, BET have to do with adsorbent morphology , the authors decided to use only the physical and ultimate analysis for this work The authors used the linearized form of the models and decided to concede on R^2 only for this work No discussion on Intra-particle was made, only the values were provided which We think is OK. The work is all about agricultural waste, so bio-sorption is appropriate for this work.
Minor REVISION comments	7- The references are old and some are inadequate. 8- The English is poor. 9-In some cases, the words optimal and optimum were used, but any optimization technique was employed in the work. 10-The introduction section is long, tiring and with repetitive information. 11-it should be clear along the manuscript, that the adsorbent was MCB and not Shea Butter Seed Husk.	Corrected Corrected Optimum in this work refers to maximum, well corrected Corrected Corrected to Shea Butter Seed Husk Carbon Black all through the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work has an interesting idea. However there are several errors in the adsorption field, which impossibilities its publication in the current form.	
---	--	--