

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_109145
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Kinetic Study of the Adsorption Capacity of Walnut shell and its biochar for Chromium Removal from Wastewater
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>A little. Any metals in wastewater present in either simple or complex ion-form. Adsorption in aqueous phase requires sufficient period to achieve equilibrium, thus the minimum period has to mentioned. The effective removal is a measure of performance relative to the initial concentration, therefore the comparison among different initial concentration must be considered the amount adsorbed as well. Otherwise, this might lead to the improper conclusion for further work. In addition, pore size of both biomass and biochar can reach nano-scale, but particle size rarely reduces to nano-scale, under which the adsorbent particle is unable to be soaked in aqueous solution.</p> <p>Abstract must be concise to cover the objective, methodology, and essential results obtained in the study without motivation, discussion or conclusion.</p> <p>The manuscript is very slightly correct in scientific point of view.</p> <p>Introduction has to describe the importance of the study without repeating the same thing in various form of sentences. Several KEYWORDS are not related to the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The whole manuscript should be written in past tenses.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deacha Chatsiriwech
Department, University & Country	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand