SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_IRJPAC_13712**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Biosorption of Metal Ions from Aqueous Solution by Immobilized Moringa oleifera Bark**
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)

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	1- Line 60, and 61, if the molarity is 0.12 M then the weight used should be 13.32 g. OR the molarity should be corrected to be 0.24 M. It should be corrected at line 67 too. 2- Line 74, synthetic waste water can't be distilled water, kaolin should be added to represent any water. Can read Ali, E.N., Muyibi, S.A., Salleh, H.M., Md. Alam, Z. and Salleh, M.R.M. (2010) Production of Natural Coagulant from *Moringa oleifera* Seed for Application in Treatment of Low Turbidity Water. *Journal of Water Resources and Protection*, **2**, 259-266. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jwarp.2010.23030 3- Line 78, why 200ppm was used here? Should clarify more. 4- Line 83, what is meant by shaker 2? 5- Line 89, why the experiment held at low pH 1 -6?? Must explain why. 6- Line 91, explain the method used. 7- Line 97, 0.1- 2 g of NaCl were prepared, to obtain 0.1-1.0 w/w????? Many things are missing here. The weight you used dissolved in how much solution and what is the solution consist of?? Is it %w/w. And why 2g not included. 8- Line 99, which method was used?? Write it. 9- Line 111, why 5 -100ppm used while it was mentioned in line 78 that 200ppm was prepared. 10- Line 122, the sorption capacity should be written: the difference in sorption capacity. 11- Line 135, IMOB should be written in full before it is shorten. 12- Line 141, it is better to write the values clearly. 13- Line 142, Figure 2, you may shrink the y-axis scale to be from 90-105 to show the difference in results clearly. 14- Line 144, 145, no need for the information mentioned unless you need to discuss it. 15- Line 150, the word vain should be vein. 16- Line 151, the word can should be changed to (to)	

	17- Line 152, should be revised to be understood clearly. 18- Line 167, metal ions and protons hydrogen ion????? Meaning?? 19- Line 167, the word (speciation) can be removed. 20- Line 167, by the end of the sentence, can you add some examples, otherwise delete the sentence. 21- Line 168, an optima should be an optimum. 22- Line 169, Zn and Fr, respectively, and 5.0 for Cd. 23- Line 170, you might shorten the y axis range to be 85-105. 24- From line 179-line186, the adsorption should be less at high concentration, the explanation given is confusing and not clear, need to be revised. 25- Line 189, *M.oleifera*..... available at low cost. Should mention in which country. 26- Line 200, heavy metal ions should be heavy metals. 27- Line 205, 109:223-249 should be 109 (2) 223-249. 28- Line 206, precious metal from refinery. Please delete from. And the journal have no issue, should be written 20: 519-532. 29- Line 211, Horsfall, M. J. And A1 $^{3+}$, should be Al^{+3} 30- Line 213, Acta Chim Slov. 31- Line 217, cut the year 1990, page no. 433-439. 32- Line 219, lead (II) not (11). 33- Line, 220, Hazardous. 34- Line 222, Int. J. Environ Sci & Tech., 5 (2) 275-285. 35- Line 227, 28 (4), 535-546. 36- Line 228, and 239 and 250, the ref. Not found. Either you cut or re -check. 37- Line 247, 23 (5), 527-536. 38- Line 249, 14 (3), 277-282. 39- Line 251, cadmium. 40- Line 251, there is no journal name. 41- Line 253, 75 (9) 812-816, not 74: 812-816. 42- Line 256, CIS should be deleted. 43- Line 257, should be 311 (2) 338-346.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1- Line 12, the result the of study (delete second {the} 2- Line 32, conventional methods instead of conveniently. 3- Line 40, the reference Upatham is not found. Either you delete or check again.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Eman N. Ali**
Department, University & Country	**Faculty of Chemical & Natural Resources Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia**