

I am re-forwarding the manuscript for proper consideration. As a full time academic staff , I am aware of what is involved in manuscript editing. Once you send a manuscript to external reviewers and thereafter reverts back to the authors and the authors respond, the onus lies on the editor to carefully cross check on the argument in favour or against.

It is not for somebody to lazily make vague comments on the manuscript he/she has not thoroughly gone through, especially when it is coming from an African author.

- Many external reviewers out of pride do not accept that the manuscripts sent to them for review are not within their area of interest and research and therefore can not properly asses the manuscript. The last reviewer of my manuscript made two incredible statements as to why the work should not be published.
1:That the references are not up to date.

- My response- it is very untrue, how can a manuscript of 2012 with the following references

Ref 17 (2009)

Ref 28 (2009)

Ref 16 (2011)

Ref 23 (2011)

Ref 18 (2012)

Refs= 3, 7, 9 and 19 (2008)

Refs= 6, 8, 10, 12 and 25 (2007).

The international standard is that a new manuscript in addition to other references must have one, two or more references that are within three (3) years old. But the latest reviewer saw only ref 18 because it is from an African author.

What is wrong with an author citing his published work? If it is relevant, look at ref 19 as at the time it was published in 2008, only three (3) references were of 2007 and yet it was published by Elsevier.

If he has any other relevant references we have not cited let him sent to us that is what I do when I review other people's work. I will not forge a reference to please him.

Secondly, he commented on the tables

The fact that he did not understand the tables, does that make the manuscript unpublishable?. It simply means he is not knowledgeable in this particular type of study and that is normal, being human ,he cannot know every thing.

Tables 1a-4a, show % absorption /recovery of sorbates by carbonized sorbents at a given particle size and contact time.

Tables 1b-4b, shows % absorption /recovery of sorbates by uncarbonized sorbents at a given particle size and contact time.

Tables 5-8, shows the % retention of sorbates by both carbonized and uncarbonized sorbents. **THE TITLE AND THE FOOTNOTES** on each table helps to explain the tables further.

Thirdly we want to state that we have reviewed the title, abstract, references and the entire manuscript according to the journal's style sent to us.

Fourthly we want to state that since no body has questioned the scientific depth of the manuscript and its relevant nature, therefore the work should be published but if you feel otherwise inform us, as an external reviewer to many other journals I do reject other people's work when there is sufficient reason to do so but not on sentiments.