



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	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	<p>The title should be changed to "Removal of Pb²⁺ and Cd²⁺ from contaminated water using low cost materials.</p> <p>Line 5. Delete wastewater Line 7. Trials should be replaced with studies Line 10. Contain should be replaced with containing Line 49. Characteristics should be replaced with characteristics Line 61. Remediation trial should be changed to Remediation studies Line 88. Should be .. the results obtained are as follows: Line 90. .. although the low should be .. although at the low Line 91. 10,000 proved no efficiency should be .. 10,000 had no pronounced ability to remove Pb Line 101 – 102.. shale has negligible ability to remove Pb and Cd</p> <p>Line 122. replace rather with than Line 130. Replace comparing with compared Line 213. Replace proved potential efficiency with proved potentially efficient Line 216. Replaced it proved high with it had high Line 218. Replace proved high with had higher Line 222. 5 and 10 mg/l</p>	<p>I agreed with reviewer Not agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer It is the same</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p> <p>I agreed with reviewer</p>
Minor REVISION comments	The article is well written. The comments above should be affected.	
Optional/General comments		