The figures of the manuscript need hard improvement. Authors should carefully look at the title, legend, and format. Also be critical when the authors need to describe the removal efficiency, for example, no removal and good removal. Mention the removal percentage instead of using vague description. Correct section and figure number and avoid the wrong reference.

1. Line 31. Section 1 is INTRODUCTION. Correct all section and sub-section number in the manuscript accordingly.
2. Add a paragraph to the end of introduction and summarize the research content in the manuscript.
3. Line 65 – 85. Material and Method is about the method and material used in the experiment. Correct the tense to past tense, for example at Line 71, change "will collects" to "were collected".
4. Line 120. Rephrase table title.
5. Line 136. Remove bucket.
6. Line 139. Include pH range of the experiment in the figure title.
7. Line 141. Refer to the right figure number in the manuscript, e.g. figure 1, 2, and etc.
8. Figure 1, 2 and 7. Kinetic data should start from Time 0, instead of 15 min.
9. Figure 1 and 2 showed the F removal by three unmodified zeolites at different pH values. First of all, the legend of figure 1 and 2 should be consistent. Secondly, in the legend of Figure 1, replace Bank by Blank. Instead of mentioning "there was no F removal" at line 153, describing the removal percentage, e.g. <10%, and saying "minimal amount of F was removed" will be more convinced.
10. Line 175. The statement is not true. From figure 3 and 4, 5g/L HDTMA was not the best dosage for the modification of Na- LSX and Na-LTA.
11. Please explain why HDTMA modified zeolite showed better F removal efficiency at line 217.
12. Line 233 Na-LSX instead of Na-LST
13. The results in Figure 3 and 7 are not comparable. Please specify the pH condition of experimental results shown in Figure 3. Figure 3 showed that Na-LSX removed ~40% F at certain pH. However, the same zeolite removed <10% F at pH 5.5 – 7.5. Is pH dominating F removal?