



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>                       |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IRJPAC_31440                                                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Activated Periwinkle Shells for the Binding and Recognition of Heavy Metal Ions from Aqueous Media |
| 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>)



**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)                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The SEM result seem not to be captured at the same magnification or distance since A and B are showing different values. (A at 5 or 6 micrometer and B at 50 or 60 micrometer). please check.</p> <p><b>THE PAPER IS GOOD AND SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AFTER THE MINOR CORRECTIONS</b></p>                 | <p>It was at that magnification (i.e 50) the analyst who helped in taking the SEM micrographs could observed something meaningful.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>Grammatical errors.<br/>rephrase the grammatical errors that has been pointed out in the paper.<br/>say something about the isotherm constants of the freundlich and langmuir and their relationship possibly.<br/>Provide the reference for the last sentence of the effects of the initial pH.</p> | <p>The reference for the last sentence of the effects of the initial pH has been provided. That is, the correction has been done.<br/>The isotherm constants of both the freundlich and Langmuir have been stated already with definition of every elements represented in the equation. With these information, I don't think we need to define or explain any thing again.</p> |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>The caption does not reflect the objective of the study. recognition does not appropriately describe the objective as stated in the introduction were you mentioned removal of Cr and Zn. you may choose to revisit it.</p>                                                                          | <p>The word recognition means to identify. For our sorbent material to bind the metal ions, there must be recognition. Overall, the caption is fine by us.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |