



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_IRJPAC_17917
Title of the Manuscript:	Adsorption Analysis of Mn(VII) from Aqueous medium using by Activated Orange Peels Powder
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is</i>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1-The adsorbent was poorly characterized. SEM, BET, FTIR and pHzpc of the adsorbent should be provided.</p> <p>2-The results should be compared with other adsorbents found in the literature, especially activated carbon.</p> <p>3- For all regression analysis: a) To verify the fit quality, only R<sup>2</sup> is not sufficient. At least one error analysis is necessary. b) Linear regression was employed but the models are originally non linear. I suggest to the authors to read the following article: "M.I. El-Khaiary, G.F. Malash, Common data analysis errors in batch adsorption studies, Hydrometallurgy 105 (2011) 314–320."</p> <p>4-Since that the results were not compared with the literature, the conclusions about the effectiveness of orange peels cannot be proved.</p> <p>5-The temperature effect was not investigated and also the thermodynamic parameters were not estimated.</p> <p>6- A detailed kinetic study was not performed.</p> <p>7- A table, comparing the results with the literature is fundamental.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>7-The English should be improved.</p> <p>8- Error bars should be inserted in the figures</p> <p>9-Standard deviations should be inserted in tables.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Guilherme Luiz Dotto</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Chemical Engineering Department, Federal university of Santa Maria, Brazil</i></b>