



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_39700
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on adsorptive behavior of Cd ²⁺ on graphene oxide: Alternative novel approach
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>) thorough



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	The authors studied “ Studies on adsorptive behavior of Cd ²⁺ on graphene oxide: Alternative novel approach” Some few comments and questions Line number 52, I would advise authors to use a simple word , not surreptitious so for that for other people who are not in the field can easily follow Line number 79, what was the reason for using 1.5 g specifically? Line number 143, is there any scientific eplaination why your graphs are not showing any particular trend? Lines 153 and 154, why is that the case?, this part is full of observations with little explanation Line 156, improve the quality of your graphs in Figure 1, labels are not clear Line 176, Statistical should be statistical Line 178, there is a red comma, maybe the authors did not notice Line 208, These interference , I think it should be this interference Line 236, Improve Figure 2, labels are not clear Line 251, revise the sentence , it not clear Line 259, correct the grammar Line 286, double check, I think it should be of not Of It is quite comprehensive and easy to follow paper and should be useful to the science community at large. I recommend this manuscript for publication	Surreptitious changed to hidden The amount was approach taking from [22] Wang et. (2009) In figure 1 for instance, blue stripes were the plotted graph while the red stripes were the origin software showing that the slope and intercept was calculated. Only pseudo 2nd order took a different trend, while the others had similar trend. Each graph followed its kinetic equation. Those values were calculated K₁ and K₂ values taken from table 3. Figure 1 corrected. Noted and changed. Thanks noted and corrected. Seen and corrected. Figure 2 corrected Sentence revised. Grammar corrected. Correction effected. Thanks Reviewer your comments are thorough.
Minor REVISION comments	Same as above	
Optional/General comments		