

## ***Interactive comment on “Removal of Dyes from Simulated Wastewater using Low Cost Activated Carbon Derived from Date Pits” by Salam A. Mohammed et al.***

**Salam A. Mohammed et al.**

salam.mohammed@unizwa.edu.om

Received and published: 16 April 2018

We are thankful for your compromising in the introduction of your valuable comments. We totally agree with all the points been raised. It is our pleasure to provide the following responses according to the respective reviewer comments: Regarding the introduction part, we have already did some editing brought some other researchers work finding about AC field. Selecting H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> as impregnant agent was based on some researchers' recommendation about its better performance as agent. The methodology section was paraphrased to provide complete details for the work procedures for chemical-physical and then physical-chemical treatment to generate AC. We have dis-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



cussed our conducted experiment data thoroughly and BET results for each sample of AC are presented in the final draft as well along the changes mentioned above For the abstract, a sentence added to explain the activation procedure (thermal-chemical, chemical-thermal) were added. Same related point was edited in the introduction section in the research objectives. For the experiment, as chemical activation a 40% concentration sulphuric acid (with mass ratio 1:4 of AC/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> respectively) and left for 24 hours. Panasonic microwave with 800 watt was used for the thermal treatment. Those information were added in the paper text Line 66-67: % as symbol was removed and just kept at the end as been recommend and the required paragraph to refer to the calibration curve was edited Line 75-76: “burnt” as term was replaced by “pyrolyzed” Line 77: the sentence is been paraphrased accordingly Table one was removed to maintain the article certainty and text flow. We have modified the discussion section to discuss the results based on the figures conducted to minimize the confusing. Line 82: in fact we had 8 samples as total have been tested, true enough four samples but we did divide them into two size distribution they became eight samples. After we edited the methodology part and in the discussion section as well, this point became very clear. For the bed setting, we have modified the part to state clearly that we used fixed bed technique. Line 97-98: what we wanted to mention here is the activation concept, we have replaced this word to be activation to eliminate the confusion. Line 103: a paragraph to explain the mentioned point was added in the research methodology. Line: all the information related to the particle BET test for each sample will be presented in the final version of the article where by the surface area, pore size and distribution data will be summarized in table form. Line 125-, 126: the formula was modified; we do admit there was error in typing the relation. Please do accept our sincerely apologize The suggested changes in the results discussion part were performed in line 126-128 Line 132, 219: “pore” as term was replaced by “size” Line 113-117: the calibration curve for each dye is been added to the article Line 135: we removed this paragraph Line 212-214: we have added further discussion regarding it and supported this discussion with other researcher reports Figures presenting the removal % were modified to display

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

the data in more clear style as time scale and as well the y axis.

---

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2018-1>, 2018.

DWESD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

