



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_36462
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary studies on equilibrium and kinetics of heavy metal ion sorption on immobilized Ficus asperifolia stem bark biomass
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		
Minor REVISION comments	I can see significant novelty in this work compared to existing literature on that same subject. The work is good with regard to clarity; its length and number of Tables are adequate. <u>Decision</u>: The manuscript is suitable for publication after minor revision. My concern is as follows: How do the adsorption capacities compare with values reported in the literature for alternative adsorbents? I suggest that the authors present a Table where could be compared their results with other of the literature.	Thank you. The results from this study were compared with other reported results in the discussion session, especially results from similar biomasses we have earlier studied. However, not to make the report too voluminous, we'll prefer to leave it like that and encourage readers to consult cited references.
Optional/General comments		