



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                       |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a>                   |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2013_BJAST_6451                                                                       |
| Title of the Manuscript: | BIOSORPTION OF NICKEL AND COPPER IN A BINARY SYSTEM USING CHITOSAN DERIVED FROM CRABS |
| Type of the Article      | Research Paper                                                                        |

**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)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authors first emphasize literature results, and then their own results. This must be changed.</li> <li>- Methodology section included several theoretical considerations.</li> <li>- </li> <li>- </li> <li>- Many results presented were not predicted in the Methodology section.</li> <li>- </li> <li>- </li> <li>- Figures presented : very low resolution.</li> <li>- Ppm is not suitable for a scientific paper.</li> </ul> | <p>Writing style differs however where necessary the result presentation has been adjusted.</p> <p>This is not very correct and the presentation of methodology is in line with the work of others.</p> <p>It could have helped if the said results were highlighted, however adjustments have been made to the few observed.</p> <p>Resolution of figures have been adjusted<br/>Ppm has been changed to <math>\text{mg/dm}^3</math></p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>English requires revision</p> <p>pH studies does not bring new knowledge to this field.</p> <p>Temkin isotherm, thermodynamic study, 1<sup>st</sup>. and 2<sup>nd</sup>.</p> <p>Order kinetics not predicted in the methods section.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <p>Yes pH –studies may not bring nwe knowledge interms of trend how ever the study is still vey vital in the sense that each metal has it peculiarity. They do not all achieve optimum adsorption at the same pH.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |