

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_117231
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of nickel adsorption by natural sisal fiber and treated with citric acid
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The authors reports a new study using natural sisal fiber and treated with citric acid as biosorbent for the adsorption of Ni in the line of purpose of toxic Ni in environmental sample clean up. The findings are important to scientific society in searching a low cost bio materials for the Ni clean up. The title is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is comparative, however can be shortened.</p> <p>Experimental: No mention of the Ni detection method</p> <p>Subsections are appropriate. But need more discussion in the results.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, but need check the chemical formulas.</p> <p>Reference are up to date and relevant.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Few minor places need correction, language is scholarly presented.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) WHAT IS THE NIO CONTENT BEFORE NI ADSORPTION? ANY XRD DATA FOR THIS? 2) SEM, UNTREATED FIBER AND TREATED FIBER HAS DIFFERENT LEGTH SCALE, IT IS HARD TO JUSTFY THE TREATED FIBER HAS SUCH CLEAN IMAGE. 3) FIGURE 3 LABLES: TRATED TO TREATED, A SPECTRA WITH NI ADSORBED? 4) FIGURE 4: CONCLUSION OF TIME ADSORPTION PROFILE? MINIMUM TIME NEEDED FOR THE ADSORPTION? 5) IMAGE 1, WHY USE THIS LABEL? ALSO IF HIGH NI INTIAL CONC IS USED, WOULD HIGHER MASS GIVE HIGHER PERCENT OF REMOVAL? 6) MORE DISCUSSION FOR FIGURE 6 AND 7, COMPARISON ON THE TREATMENT IS NEEDED. 7) Further discussion on how this fiber is compare with reported biomass materials? 8) Add the log Qe vs log Ce curve for the isotherms.? 9) How was Ni concentration determined after the adsorption experiments, kinetics and isotherm? 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Enju Wang
Department, University & Country	St. John's University, USA