



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_49010
Title of the Manuscript:	Adsorption Performance of Packed Bed Column for the Removal of Lead (II) using Velvet Tamarind (<i>Dialium indum</i>) Shells
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>)

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>This paper is rather confusing. The results of the adsorbent characterization are discussed in more details than its adsorption capacity. It is not understood why though ... unless those other authors also prepared activated carbon from velvet tamarind shells...</p> <p>Introduction is too general. In fact, there are many sentences in the paper that do not really carry meaning, sort of 'blank' sentences that should be avoided.</p> <p>Majority of the references are old. It gives impression the data might old too...</p> <p>The adsorption capacity of 1.73 mg/g is clearly low, which raise a question why such adsorbent should be used...</p> <p>Also it is not clear what the use of the models in this study is. The experimental data should be compared to the modelling data in the plots.</p> <p>In terms of data scope, there is no much data to present in this paper as only a few parameters were tested.</p> <p>The authors need seriously revise this paper to make it comparable to other good publications on adsorption.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>All corrections have been done</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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