



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_23224
Title of the Manuscript:	Equilibrium Isotherm Study for Removal of Mn (II) from Aqueous Solutions by Using Novel Bioadsorbent Tinospora cordifolia
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Remarks</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The use of microbial and plant biomass for the detoxification of industrial effluents for environmental protection and recovery of valuable metals offers a potential alternative to existing treatment technologies</p> <p>R: A potential alternative for which side or point of view</p> <p>This research, <u>study</u> the removal of manganese from water</p> <p>R: English mistake</p> <p>at the room temperature (<math>27 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}</math>)</p> <p>R: is this temperature so critical like this ?</p> <p>The results obtained indicated that <math>1.0\text{gm } 50\text{mL}^{-1}</math> adsorbent</p> <p>R: what this values mean (<math>1.0\text{gm } 50\text{mL}^{-1}</math>)?</p> <p>The size of the adsorbent particle was <math>1.18\mu\text{m}</math></p> <p>R: how you determine the size <math>1.18\mu\text{m}</math></p> <p>The optimum pH value for Mn(II) adsorption onto the biomass <i>T. cordifolia</i> was found to be 4.0.</p> <p>R: at pH = 4 the bio-materials positively charged and M(II) is also positive so this situation is not good to uptake the ions from water</p> <p>The characterization of the biomass <i>T. cordifolia</i> was done by FTIR.</p> <p>R: what was the interest of the FTIR</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Manganese (II), Biosorption, Coal mine waste water, FTIR</p> <p>R : not well selected</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>At present, a number of technologies can be used to remove heavy metals from the contaminated waste water such as filtration, adsorption, chemical precipitation, ion exchange,</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>membrane separation and electro remediation methods. However, most of this method might not be efficient in removing heavy metals at very low concentrations, and could be relatively expensive.</p> <p>R: you mentioned adsorption as technology to remove heavy metals and your method is also adsorption so what is the difference between your adsorption and the other</p> <p>In the present investigation, the potential of a plant biomass has been assessed for the removal of manganese ion. The effects of various parameters have been studied and the results are presented in this paper.</p> <p>R:The biomass was used to remove heavy metals a long time ago . The majorities of natural biomass plants fibers contain the chemical functions ( -OH, C=O, NH<sub>2</sub>, COO, etc ) so all play the same role by complexation of positive ions</p> <p>In conclusion you don't provide new scientific work</p> <p>Examples</p> <p>1- <a href="#">Beom-Goo Lee</a> &amp; <a href="#">Roger M. Rowell</a> Removal of Heavy Metal Ions from Aqueous Solutions Using Lignocellulosic Fibers Journal of Natural Fibers <u>Volume 1</u>, <u>Issue 1</u>, 2004, pages 97-108</p> <p>2- C. Fallico, S. Troisi, A. Molinari, and M. F. Rivera. Characterization of broom fibers for PRB in the remediation of aquifers contaminated by heavy metals Biogeosciences, 7, 2545–2556, 2010</p> <p>3- <a href="#">Jamil Rima</a>, <a href="#">Antoine Ghauch</a>, <a href="#">Marwan Ghaouch</a> Cleaning of water contaminated by heavy metals using beetroot fibers as biofilter: <u>Toxicological &amp; Environmental Chemistry</u> Volume 75, Issue 1-2, March 2000, pages 89-97</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHOD</b></p> <p>sieved through 1.18µm mesh</p> <p>R: 1.18µm or mesh?</p> <p>After that, the biomass was stay for 30 minutes with HCl (0.1M) solution.</p> <p>R: the attack by acid should disturb the chemical functions of the natural fibers how you show that the acid does not</p>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>disturb the biomass?</p> <p>Effect of 121 pH on biosorption</p> <p>R: I have a doubt about this result because when pH is 4 the biomass is positively charged and because the positive charge of the metal the uptake efficiency is not maximum</p> <p>Effect of concentration on the percentage removal of Mn(II)</p> <p>R: between 50 ppm and 500 ppm we cannot observe big differences of the retention efficiency</p> <p><b>Effect of Contact Time</b></p> <p>R:I think that the removal phenomena is a complexation reaction between the fibers and the ions so we don't need a long contact time because this reaction in instantaneously so the contact time is so fast</p> <p><b>COMPARATIVE STUDY OF <i>TINOSPORA CORDIFOLIA</i> WITH OTHER ADSORBENTS</b></p> <p>R: no need for the comparison because all the natural fibers contain the chemical function and then the uptake efficiency must be similar</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b></p> <p>-This work is not original . More than several hundred similar work were published a long time ago</p> <p>- Fundamental mistakes are found in the text like pH effect , residential time , bad interpretation</p> <p>-Bad English</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jamil Rima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chemistry Department, Lebanese University, Lebanon</b>