



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The current manuscript is well-written. Only minor typographical errors were found. However, the current work is a mere extension a published paper (Bioresource Technology 99 (2008) 7902–7905) by the same authors. The procedure, except for additional of 2 sorbents and increase time of mopping, is almost identical. The findings are not new (i.e., would be expected especially by any “person skilled in the art”). Suggestion: To avoid any ‘misleading’, in the problem statements (in the introduction), authors should refer specifically to their previous work and state clearly (comprehensively as possible) the contribution and as to why the current work warrant publication (in a peer review journal).	We agree that the work is an extension of already published paper reference 19, hence the choice of the title. Being an extension the methodology is not expected to change. It is important to establish salient points in the present manuscript which shows that the work is an improvement on the previous paper (reference 19) 1. Four sorbents (two protein



SDI Review Form 1.6

		based and two cellulosic based). This enabled comparison to be made between protein and cellulotics amongst the two protein, and amongst the two cellulotics, lines 295-297. This makes room for choice and cost consideration 2. We have shown that the sorbents can be used several times, though we stopped at 4th use, this makes room for sustainability is actual field work. .Tables 1a-4a and 1b-4b.This makes room for
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		choice and cost consideration.Lines 370-372 3. We have revealed that sorption and recovery decrease across the table (horizontally), showing the extent of saturation of the pores, lines 302-305,363-365 4. We have paired both % sorptiona / recovery for both carbonized and uncarbonized sorbosized making room for easy comparison. Tables 1a- 4a and 1b-4b 5. We have brought to the fore %
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		retention which is an important factor when clean up does not require recovery and disposal.Tables5-8. Retention was not in the previous manuscript ,ref 19 6. % retention of carbonized and uncarbonized sorbents are also padded tables 5-8 for easy comparison 7. We have established two types of mechanism of adsorption/absorption. This is the real science in the study. Lines 339-344.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		8. Here we have better explained why different specific features of both protein and cellulose enabled them sorb oil defferently lines 344-362. 9. We have shown the type and magnitude of oil spill in which the sorbents can be applied, lines 384-390. 10.We have shown the response time and crises period,391-392 11.Leachability test was done with diesel (fig 1).Lines 397-399
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		12.Results have been reported separately bringing out the best contact time for each sorbate and sorbent,lines 144-279. This is important in actual field operation as it enables clean-up operators to know the actual exposure time they can adopt. 13.We have stated that atmospheric weather condition is an important factor which is a must in actual field, lines 318-321.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		14.The arrangement in lines 376-379, are not the same with that in the previous manuscript, that in the previous manuscript is the arrangement of the sorbates in order of highest sorption by the respective sorbent while that in the present manuscript is the arrangement of the sorbents according to particle size in order of highest sorption of the sorbates. Since the work is and improvement on the previous paper we cannot repeat the
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		introduction we have extended it to other published works since we are not original researchers in the field and it is also an attempt to minimize limitation (closing of gap). The title says it all as to why it should be published in a peer review journal, (see the points enumerated above), more so in this days of nano science study
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Only minor typographical errors as indicated in the reviewed manuscript. Also, check whether unit such as minute and hour when written in abbreviation (min and hr) can be pluralized (mins and hrs).	The corrections are effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	