

The only thing that was corrected was the title (sulphuric acid treated maize ...). However, the treatment procedure is not described in an experimental section (2.1). I have still some doubts about a correctness of the isotherm models used. The experimental data in tables suggest that the Q_e values decrease with increasing C_e values, which is not consistent with commonly used isotherm equations. Authors should specify the models used for the data evaluation, estimate and discuss(!) the model parameters.

Uncertainties of the results should be specified (estimated). For example, the data in Table III change only insignificantly with time in the interval of 30 to 180 min. Hence, the related discussion seems to be speculative and the conclusions are questionable.

REF: Response to the above comments

1. Title now corrected tallying with procedure it was a mistake we have other work on sulphuric acid-treated maize tassels
2. We agree that the Q_e values decrease with increasing C_e values, while the reviewer argue that its not whats in literature we disagree on that because there are some literature reporting similar trends e.g A. Ozer and HB Pirincci(2006) The adsorption of Cd(II) ions on sulphuric acid treated wheat bran. Journal of Hazardous materials B137:849-859
3. We did specify the models used they are even indicated on the graphs presented under results and discussion. The correlation coefficients are reported in table 1 and the calculated model constants
4. All tables have been removed as the same information is being indicated on graphs.
5. Authors feel its unnecessary to present the Freundlich constants as the data did not fit well. Though we did calculate the values and did not report them.