



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_52104
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ADSORPTION OF LEAD, Pb AND CADMIUM, Cd BY ACTIVATED CARBON FROM JATROPHA CACUS AND MORINGA HUSK
Type of the Article	Original 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please recast the title using the correction I provided in the manuscript. 2. The abstract is not properly written which should be recast. 3. The literature review in the introduction should be updated and improved with at least ten references. 4. The problem statement in the introduction is not well indicated and should be worked on.. 5. On what basis the author(s) selected Cd and Pb metal ions for the adsorption. 6. The aim of the work is not clearly explained. 7. Analysis of wastewater from dam should be made. 8. Show composition of wastewater before and after treatment. 9. How are you sure that adsorption has taken place. 10. Please describe the experimental procedure for the removal of methylene blue. 11. Include equation for efficiency of adsorption. 12. Provide the equations for Langmuir and Freundlich isotherms. 13. There are numerous typographical and grammatical mistakes which should be corrected. 14. The mechanism of adsorption should be included as a sub-section. 15. The adsorption-desorption and regeneration studies should be tried using different solvents. 16. A table for the comparison of monolayer adsorption capacity for Cd and Pb using different adsorbents should be provided. 17. Please see manuscript for more comments on corrections to be made. 18. The results and the discussion part should also be improved. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J.U. Ani
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria