



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_54361
Title of the Manuscript:	Calcium and Magnesium Adsorption by Activated Carbon Produced with Alternative Materials
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. There are too many grammar/spelling errors, making the manuscript hard to understand. Such as: In abstract, "residues of agro-industrial origin" can be revised as "residues originated from agro-industry"; "an Activated Carbon (AC) Experiment" should be revised as "an Activated Carbon (AC)"; "The 50C/50B mixture indicated by the statistic", I can not understand; "under flow of 100 ml/min", It should be "under N₂ flow of 100 ml/min" according to the following text; "desalinator reject", I can not understand; "The result of the characterization of calcium and magnesium" can not revised as "The result of the characterization of adsorbing calcium and magnesium"; "with the reject", I can not understand.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Thus, the language must be thoroughly improved. It is recommended to ask a English native teacher/colleague to correct the language, or ask a language editing organization to edit the language.</p> <p>2. The quality of the all figures should be improved. Such as, the title of longitudinal axis of the Fig. 1 is not clear; Annotation mark in the figures should be moved to inside of the figures, in that the figures are more clear after shrinking;</p> <p>3. In section, 2.4, "produced with 50% HCl solution", this condition does not appear in previous description.</p> <p>4. "Regarding magnesium, it can be seen in Fig. 3 that there was no reduction in its concentration at any of the contact times of activated charcoal with the desalination tailings, compared to the control (384.18 mg / l)". This statement should be confirmed. It seems to be incorrect from the Fig. 3. If this statement is confirmed, please address the description in the title and abstract. How to understand "compared to the control (384.18 mg / l)"? This control is not present in the experimental section.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	H.-Y. He
Department, University & Country	China