



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 <i>(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)</i>
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" 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 42: "solution" should read "solutions" • Line 46: "easily to be obtained" should read "easy to obtain" • Line 48: "which attributed" should read "which was attributed" • Line 52: remove the word "content" • Line 54: "it is mainly" should read "it mainly" • Line 63: the phrase "and submit" should read "and subjected to" • 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. • Line 74: Author needs to throw light on what is meant by "reacted solution" • 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" • Line 95: "one h" should read "one hour" • Line 100: "proved efficiency " should read "proved efficient" • Line 101: Author needs to be consistent with the unit of time{ h or hr} • Line 102: "contain" should read "containing" <p>TABLES: RESULTS SHOUD BE CAPTURED SHOWING MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN TABLES 1, 3 AND 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 106: the phrase "which is a character of Pb" should read "which is characteristic of Pb" • Line 123: "initially exist" should read "initially existing" • Line 136: "water contain" should read " water containing" • Line 138: "permissible one" should read "permissible level" • Line 146: "lead" should read "led" • Line 156: line not clear. Phrase "exchange process" not appropriately used. 	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Line 160: “concentration” should read “concentrations”• Line 160: “additio” should read “addition”• Line 162: “efficiency remove” should read “efficiency to remove”• Line 165: “reduce to be” should read “reduce to”• Line 167: “extended” should read “shown”• Line 169: “which” should read “where” <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”• Line 221: “extended” should read “shown”• Line 222: “while reduces” should read “while reducing” <p><u>REFERENCE</u></p> <p>3. “Evange1ou” should read “Evangelou” 8. State the date the internet was accessed</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer