



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_54571
Title of the Manuscript:	Removal of copper using activated carbon adsorbent and its antibacterial antifungal activity
Type of the 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>)

**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>Attention to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Typewriter mistakes;</li> <li>2) In manuscript some sentences must be revised.</li> <li>3) I think the sorbent material tested is obtained from the charcoal, chitosan and sawdust treated with sulphuric acid. If the bio sorbent contained sawdust treated with sulphuric acid, then the new bio sorbent has a negatively surface, and yes, the copper cations can be retained on this surface, and can give antimicrobial/antifungal properties. But, from manuscript does not results clear in which way was obtained the new bio sorbent.</li> <li>4) In the pictures presented in the manuscript, the antimicrobial / antifungal activities are not visible (In fact, I do not see in the pictures presented in the manuscript the inhibition diameters). Perhaps the authors have pictures in which this effect is visible.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The article can be interesting, but in this form cannot be published.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)The authors must to read with attention the manuscript; because must improve or replace more sentences which are not well writing.</li> <li>2) From manuscript does not results clear in which way was obtained the new bio sorbent.</li> <li>3)The pictures from antimicrobial / antifungal activities are not clear; if the authors do not replace these with another picture, then in my opinion these must be removed from manuscript.</li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<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 mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Nicoleta Radu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Romania</b>