Editor's Comment:

1-) the use of "Calcinated" in replacement of "Calcined",

2-) improvement in Figures, authors could prepare new graphs using a new scale on the Y axis (%), marking just 70-80-90-100% (in the way it is readers suffer by polluted images, and the lack of errors bars),

3-) I prefer Conclusions in a more fluid text, avoiding itens and topics, but it is personal preference,

4-) Table 2 reports a notable difference when compared to the expected wastewater reported in the introduction (second paragraph), authors must explain!

5-) Considering pKa and volatility of HCN, how could the authors infer that the high % of removal below pH 4 is due to obtain and not by volatilization? It must become clear,

6-) A deeper statistical approach must be given in order to validate the findings, at least a polled Student-t test between the two proposed sorbents.

In such sense, and considering that not all relevant points raised by the referees were solved, I guess the proposed revised paper is not yet in condition for publication.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Felipe Silva Semaan

Professor, Department of Analytical Chemistry, Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil