



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2343
Title of the Manuscript:	Extension of comparison of the mopping ability of chemically modified and unmodified biological wastes on crude oil and its lower fractions.

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 9 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors made research in right direction. Due to situation industry desperately need sustainable, cheap and efficient sorbing materials. Agricultural waste is the right answer. I would like to encourage authors to make additional progress in this direction. Anyway, there are some comments on applied article. 1. The references are out of date. Please, recheck references. 2. Measuring of the sorbency characteristics are satisfying for presented work, but for comparison with other sorbent materials it is preferable to use standardized methods as for example ASTM F726-12 Standard Test Method for Sorbent Performance of Adsorbents or ASTM. 3. In line 145 authors mentioned that the highest absorption of crude oil is at 120 what isn't in	1. We have included more recent references 2. That we will do when we use other agricultural waste as he has suggested 3. The correction is effected 4. We believe tales are the best for this data graphs will be too cumberson. Imaging how many graphs we will have just from table 1a alone.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	below. 5. Cellulosic sorbents without additional chemical treatment are not suitable for water surface cleaning and comparison with cotton is not appropriate. Please refer on expanded polypropylene instead on cotton. 6. Use term sorbing which is common term for adsorption and absorption.	It is true but we have stated the solution in line 392-393 5b. We cannot compare with poly propylene because i. Poly propylene is synthetic material and not biodegradable. ii. It is not a waste iii. We did not study the sorption properties of polypropylene bute we have studied that of cotton and is properly referenced here as ref 24 6. We have used “absorption/adsorption,” “absorbed”, “sorbed”, “mopped”, “sorption” and “ absorbing” see lines 367,147,148,149,157,211,291,301,308 etc all these means “sorbing”.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors made good research work and it will be preferable to expand their research also on other agricultural waste materials	
--	---	--