



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1-) the use of "Calcinated" in replacement of "Calcined",</p> <p>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),</p> <p>3-) I prefer Conclusions in a more fluid text, avoiding itens and topics, but it is personal preference,</p> <p>4-) Table 2 reports a notable difference when compared to the expected wastewater reported in the introduction (second paragraph), authors must explain!</p> <p>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,</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Calcined in the article refers to the calcination of an adsorbent. Therefore the use of calcined is correct. Noted and corrected.</p> <p>I prefer it to be itemized.</p> <p>Please check that again. The pH that is reported in Table 2 falls between the ranges of 3.4 to 5.2. That was not stated anywhere in the discussion of this work.</p> <p>That's for further research. For now the graphical representation is enough to distinguish between the two adsorbents.</p>