



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_49474
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency of Sawdust from selected African indigenous wood spp as a low cost adsorbent for removal of heavy metal from contaminated water
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The heading for table 1 is orphaned. Please make sure the table heading and the data are together. 2. Please explain the superscripts a,b,c,d,j in table 1. 3. The dependence on pH is at variance with work from other researchers, please proffer an explanation of what you think is happening. 4. References 10 to 19 are not formatted as the rest of the text (line spacing). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed with the reviewer, the table has been formatted with introduction as suggested. 2. Agreed with reviewer, all superscripts are now defined in the manuscript. 3. The treatment efficacy is related to pH in this study which may be attributed to the wood spp used and the conditions of treatment. The results was reported based on the outcome of the experiment; and since sawdust from this spp has not been really utilized, this is a potential contribution to existing knowledge. 4. All references are now well formatted with same line spacing. Thanks to the reviewers.
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>	