SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Chemical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CSIJ_58808**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Biosorption of Bromophenol Blue from Aqueous Solution using Flamboyant (Delonix Regia) Pod**
Type of the Article	**Original Research**

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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	1. The submitted picture was of poor quality. There a lot of misperception on them. As a result, some important information was also lost. Please, repair with the new ones and consider in the picture visualization so that the readers could read properly. 2. On the paper, bromophenol blue or BPB was mentioned. But it does not tell us. What is the best explanation to describe it in your introduction? How's important to overcome or remove them by the adsorbent or FBP/AFBP? 3. The flamboyant as a raw material for the adsorbent usage has been used before (dye removal). What's the novelty of this research? Please, give an explanation. 4. The authors mentioned that the difference value of the results because of the different species used in previous studies. It might be better if the authors tell or write the kind or type of flamboyant species used in previous studies. 5. FTIR's result of AFBP, after treatment using $ZnCl_2$, there is a new low-sharp peak at around 2500 cm^{-1}. What is it? 6. Why the FBP does not examine? It is better if the AFBP results could be compared by control or pure FBP (without $ZnCl_2$ activation). 7. The kinetic study is closer to the PSO. It may need more explanation than comparing it with the example references.	1. The affected figures have been adjusted and replaced 2. The bromophenol is classified as one of the dyes stuff that affects the environment adversely and hence the need to reduce its impact 3. No study has reported its removal with adsorbent produced from FBP. The findings of this study will add to the body of knowledge that FBP has now been used for BPB removal 4. The species were not mentioned in the literature but the conclusion was drawn as inference on what is usually reported for different characteristics observed in plant materials 5. The sharp peak at 2500 cm^{-1} is assigned to O–H stretching bond which is found in the chemical structure of BPB (Figure 1, above). 6. Some studies such as those referenced in the study mostly focus on the improved materials with the notion that the activation process has improved the sorption properties considerably 7. The implication is that the adsorption process is chemisorption
	1. Res.es? (#Introduction line 3 paragraph 4) 2. Researcher should be changed with researcher (#Introduction line 6 paragraph 5) 3. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#Introduction line 9 and 10 paragraph 7) 4. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#Introduction line 1 and 2 paragraph 8) 5. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#Introduction line 5 paragraph 9) 6. 1 ½ should be changed with 1.5 h or 90 minutes (#Determination of ash content line 2) 7. cm-1 should be changed with cm^{-1} (#Surface characteristic line 3 paragraph 9) 8. The mentioned reference is not consistent (#2.7.3 Elovich model line 3) 9. cm-1 should be changed with cm^{-1} (#FTIR analysis) 10. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#FTIR analysis) 11. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#3.4 Isotherm Parameters line 7 paragraph 4) 12. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#3.5.1 Pseudo first order line 4 paragraph 1) 13. The correlation values of R should be written in R^2, not R2. Please be consistent. 14. References No. 11, 15, 16, 36, 53, 57, 68, 72, 73 were too old. Consider changing with the 5 years late of paper. 15. Some typos and incorrect notation were found (#Conclusion line 3)	• All these have been adjusted as suggested
Optional/General comments	The authors should repair and explain the discussion clearly. The authors should also perform the research novelty of the paper. Please write the notation or chemical formula correctly.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	There are no ethical issues in this article and this has rightly been stated