



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13315
Title of the Manuscript:	LEAD Removal from Contaminated Water by Corn and Palm Nut Husks
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	Abstract: the author needs to arrange the abstract in a right pattern and should avoid mixing of background and aim of the study Introduction: the author needs to review this section clearly and Provide evidence that lead has been isolated in either water or soil in the study area. In addition he mentioned many materials that are use in remediation but he/she failed to provide shortcomings or lacuna attached to each of the material listed. Methodology: The author describes many procedures in this section without any citation. Results: the author presented many tables without appropriate explanation. In addition, he/she use table and figure to represent one item, therefore he/she should select one (table or figure). Discussion: The discussion is very scanty. Some references need to be added to strengthen the result observed by the author. The author should relate his results to what other researchers in the area have obtained. In addition the author needs to discuss all the tables of the results	Author is appreciative of the reviewer for the time and effort expended on this manuscript and the valuable corrections and comments. The corrections and comments have been integrated into the revised manuscript. Abstract: This was revised Introduction: Three references citing the evidence of lead pollution in the study area have been added. Methodology: Short comings of the mentioned materials used in lead remediation have been included. Results: Expanded, tables removed but left figures Discussion: Expanded discussions and added references to relate results to what other researchers have reported.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		