



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_40009
Title of the Manuscript:	REMOVAL OF α - AND β -ENDOSULFAN FROM SOILS BY USING NATURAL AND SYNTHETIC SURFACTANTS
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>)

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	Lines 34-40 are poorly written. Lines 44-48 the sentence is very long and confusing- research gap is not clear In methodology the surfactant used with different types –but in introduction no information or background about the role of each surfactant in the removing process Lines 55-58 the soil description is very poor(provide soil type, minerals, sand, percentages) Line 124 (Guar gum did not show a reduction of surface tension, even when concentration increases up to 1200 mg/L. is guar gum a surfactant ?????? (review) Lines 164-166, the discussion of the result did not provide similar finding in the area also the soil type influence the adsorption. (review the adsorption process explain more) Lines 205-207 provide references please	The sentence was reworded The sentence was reworded for clarity The Table 2 was added to include the characterization of the soil The following sentence was added. “The natural molecules maybe do not lower the surface tension of water, but they form stable emulsions that helps in the contaminated soil washing process [24]”. The sentence was reworded for clarity References were included
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The chemical concepts were missed in the manuscript. The comparison was good but the data provided was so limited Some lines is written in bad English.	The manuscript was reviewed to improve the style and correct English