



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_37714
Title of the Manuscript:	Treatment of Red Mud with Distilled Water to Improve its Efficiency to Remove Methylene blue from Aqueous Solution
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Line 31: Methylene blue is not the most soluble dye in water. However it is one of the dyes that is soluble in aqueous solution - Line 49: There is no need to mention authors names as these reference can be grouped in the end of the sentences as [6-9]. Also please check the format as require by this journal, usually if author name is mentioned, there is no need to add the year as the main citation format is by numbering. - Authors should include the magnification in the caption of Fig 2. - Section 3.3. It is very strange to use extreme low concentration of 10 ppm dye during pH study. An extreme low concentration of MB used for optimising the condition is a major concern. Which would explain why high % removal observed for long range of pH from 4 to 10. Authors would probably obtain more accurate data when using higher concentration such as 50 ppm or 100 ppm. - Did author determine the pH point of zero charge for the adsorbent? - Table 2 and Fig 9 caption. Correct "Dubinine" to "Dubinin" - Many of the parameters used in the text (e.g. q_e, q_t, q_m) not subscripted properly. - Fig 10. Why contact time 20-120min used for pseudo-first, but for pseudo-second the ranged from 20-1500min? author should remove the datapoint at 1500min - Author should place table 5 in section 3.8. - Please check unit of k_2. If authors used mg/g in the calculation of q_e, the unit of k_2 should be $g\ mg^{-1}\ min^{-1}$. - Author use Ho's expression of pseudo second order. Authors should credit the original work properly. → Y.S. Ho, G. McKay. Sorption of dye from aqueous solution by peat, Chem. Eng. J., 70, (1998) 115-124.	Line 31: Most deleted Line 49: corrected as required by reviewer Line 52: Bhatnagar <i>et al.</i> (2011) [7] replaced by The authors of the review [7] Comment3: Fig. 2. Magnification added as (a) RM (300nm) and (b) RMW (250 μm) Section 3.3: Reviewer may be right but our use of 10 mg/L was based on low adsorption of methylene blue at high concentration especially within the time studied and also based on other reported studies Comment 5: we did not determine PZC that is why it was cited Comment 6: corrected Comment 7: corrected Comment 8: 20-120 used for pseudo-first order because equilibrium was attained in 1440 minutes so that point (1440) is not valid for 1st order modeling according to $\ln(q_e - q_t)$. But for second-order modeling it does not depend on equilibrium amount (or q_e) so all the points were used for 2nd order modeling. The data point is 1440 representing 24 hours not 1500. Comment 9: done and references harmonised Comment 10: corrected Comment 11: done and references harmonised
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		