



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_8023
Title of the Manuscript:	Removal Pb ²⁺ and Cd ²⁺ from contaminated water by alternative low-cost materials
Type of the 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	<p>TOPIC: Should read- Removal of Pb²⁺ and Cd²⁺ from contaminated water using alternative low- cost materials.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: The following corrections are recommended as indicated in the lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 5: the phrase "it should be removed" should read "they should be removed" Line 6: "as a potential sorbents" should read " as potential sorbents" Line 8: change the word "submitted" to "subjected" Line 10: the phrase "water contain" should read "water containing" Line 11: "Fe-Oxide" should read " iron oxide" Line 14: "The research aims to use" should read " the research seeks to use" Line 16: the phrase "discharging to sanitary sewer" should be changed to "use in irrigation"[this conclusion falls more in line with the focus of the Journal] <p style="text-align: center;"><u>INTRODUCTION</u></p> <p>The author was silent on any previous work done by other researchers in the field of removal of heavy metals from contaminated water. This is important because his topic talked of use of alternative materials. It is important therefore to know what the current practice is; especially regarding the metals he worked on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phrase " proved no efficiency" should read " did not prove efficient" <p style="text-align: center;"><u>MATERIALS AND METHODS</u></p> <p>The following corrections are recommended in the lines stated :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 36:"accurate diluting" should read "accurate dilution" I agreed with reviewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agreed with reviewer not agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer not agreed with reviewer not agreed with reviewer Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Line 42: "solution" should read "solutions" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 46: "easily to be obtained" should read "easy to obtain" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 48: "which attributed" should read "which was attributed" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 52: remove the word "content" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 54: "it is mainly" should read "it mainly" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 63: the phrase "and submit" should read "and subjected to" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 70: Author should be clear on what he means by "suspended and clear water". He should clearly state how they were obtained or prepared. I agreed with reviewer • • Line 74: Author needs to throw light on what is meant by "reacted solution" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 76: Author needs to mention the method used before quoting a reference. <p><u>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 92: "shale reduces" should read "shale reduced" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 95: "one h" should read "one hour" I agreed with reviewer • • Line 100: "proved efficiency " should read "proved efficient" I agreed with reviewer • 	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 101: Author needs to be consistent with the unit of time{ h or hr} I agreed with reviewer • • Line 102: “contain” should read “containing I agreed with reviewer” • • TABLES: RESULTS SHOUD BE CAPTURED SHOWING MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN TABLES 1, 3 AND 4. • • Line 106: the phrase “which is a character of Pb” should read “which is characteristic of Pb” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 123: “initially exist” should read “initially existing” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 136: “water contain” should read “ water containing” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 138: “permissible one” should read “permissible level” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 146: “lead” should read “led” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 156: line not clear. Phrase “exchange not agreed with reviewer process” not appropriately used. • Line 160: “concentration” should read “concentrations” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 160: “additio” should read “addition” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 162: “efficiency remove” should read “efficiency to remove” I agreed with reviewer • 	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 165: “reduce to be” should read “reduce to not agreed with reviewer” • • Line 167: “extended” should read “shown I not greed with reviewer” • • Line 169: “which” should read “where” I agreed with reviewer • <p>Lines 177 to line 191: These are more appropriate for inclusion in the introduction. They should be modified and included in ending paragraphs of the introduction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 218: “was effective” should read “more effective” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 221: “extended” should read “shown” I agreed with reviewer • • Line 222: “while reduces” should read “while reducing” I agreed with reviewer • <p><u>REFERENCE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3. “Evange1ou” should read “Evangelou” I agreed with reviewer • 8. State the date the internet was accessed I agreed with reviewer 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		