



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_3695
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic, Isothermal, and Thermodynamic Studies of the Biosorption of Methylene Blue from Synthetic Wastewater using Cow Hooves

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Title is confusing as the material CH is being applied as an adsorbent and not as a biosorbent, title needs to be changed, Abstract There are some deficiencies and contradictions: authors must mention the adsorbent dose for a specified volume, that has to be mentioned, ii...298-318 K, 298-308 K? 2.2 represents adsorption and not 'biosorption' studies, Figures 1 a and b could be drawn together for a better comparison, 3.2 'The maximum adsorption of MB took place at pH 11', how can the authors conclude that when they have not conducted experiments beyond pH11? Isoelectric point! The method reported in a well known method and need not to be reproduced here. Simply quoting the ref and your result will be OK,	The title has been modified The suggested corrections have been effected. Contradictions and deficiencies have been properly addressed Noted and corrected They have been drawn together The statement has been modified Noted and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The discussion on pH_{zpc} needs to be written in a better manner. 3.4 is an obvious finding and can be simply reported in a few lines, L205-208 It could....surface' This sounds unusual and requires a few experiments to verify this finding, or provide a reference to support author's findings or delete the disputed statement or carry out experiments more carefully, L231 '...that the Freundlich isotherm model exhibited better fit than the Langmuir model.' Yes, then get away with Langmuir's model, Please check eq 5 for correctness, and report second order kinetics only, Add a few refs of 2013 In Section 3.8 authors have used eq. no 7 for the calculation of Thermodynamic parameters. I would like to suggest authors to use Langmuir's equilibrium constant K_L obtained from equation 3 instead of using K_e.	Noted The statement has been deleted. The experiments on the effect of temperature and concentration have been re-conducted more carefully and the data are presented and reported accordingly. Some other reviewers (especially reviewer 2) suggested that we should apply more isotherm and kinetic models for better description of the adsorption mechanism. Noted and corrected Noted and effected (Though several authors do use K_e instead of K_L)
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check the language of the article carefully	Ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an ordinary article but provides new data. It can be acceptable only after the comments are addressed properly,	