



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	This manuscripts needs major revision for the following points: - 1. Title : LEAD rewrite it as Lead 2. Keywords: Potash???? 3. - Introduction needs to rewrite it again and reduce the huge number of references which is not related directly to the adsorption process. 4. - Spaces between words such as The result demonstrates. Lead nitrate, Inching. Many like this in the text. 5. -Line 109 lead Nitrate// lead nitrate. 6. - Section 2.2 and 2.3 must be in one section 7. - No effect to the temperature, pH, concentration and other parameters discussed in this Ms. - Results were discussed poorly. - Conclusion is not acceptable. 10.Authors are careless in writing this manuscript	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. 1. Corrected 2. Potash has been removed from the keywords 3. Introduction has been rewritten and the # of references reduced 4. Spaces between words have been added where applicable throughout the text 5. Corrected 6. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 have been merged. 7. No pH or temperature effect was studied as the protocol was intentionally designed to mimic how the villagers will use the technology for the mitigation of lead contaminated water. 8. Results have been revised. 9. Conclusion has been revised 10. Authors regret the inconvenience and appreciate reviewer's time and effort expended in the review of the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		