|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Review comments** | **Response to comments** |
| 1 |  Ln 298 - 303: the discussion you added about the pHpzc of your sorbents is a bit vague - you should provide more detail than just saying "the nature of the functional group changed and the adsorption altered" - at solution pH below the pzc of your sorbent, we expect the surface to have a net positive charge, creating electrostatic interactions between anions in solution (such as the Pb(II)) and the surface, promoting adsorption. Please discuss this in clearer detail.  | The effect of pH discussion was rephrased and elaborated. However, the results was contradictory with mostly reported literature. The experiments were repeated three times and found same finding. Furthermore, the decrease in Pb(II) in basic medium could be due to competitive adsorption with sodium cation because the NaOH was used for achieving basic pH. |
| 2 | In addition, in the rest of the paper, you have compared theAC prepared with the original biomass, but in figure 8(B) you seem to only present data for the AC? Please add the pzc of the RB seeds, and then discuss how the activation process impacted the pzc. | The mentioned corrections are incorporated. |
| 3 | You still have a lot of typographical errors in the text - missing spaces in particular. For example, in lines 20-24 (abstract), there are 6 missing spaces. Please check for this across the entire manuscript. | The mentioned corrections are incorporated. |
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