# Decision on submission to Waste Management Bulletin

1 message

**Waste Management Bulletin** <em@editorialmanager.com> Sun, Dec 10, 2023 at 3:59 PM
Reply-To: Waste Management Bulletin <wmb@elsevier.com>
To: Triastuti Sulistyaningsih <triastuti.s@mail.unnes.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: WMB-D-23-00145

Green synthesis of gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as an adsorbent for methyl orange textile dyes

Dear Dr Sulistyaningsih,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Waste Management Bulletin.

I have completed my evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below. Please resubmit your revised manuscript by Jan 14, 2024.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed.

To submit your revised manuscript, please log in as an author at https://www.editorialmanager.com/wmb/, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

Waste Management Bulletin values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,
Antoni Sánchez
Co-Editors-in-Chief
Waste Management Bulletin

Editor and Reviewer comments:

Please explain in deep detail all your revisions.
Both reviewers have attached a document with revisions.

Reviewer 1: WMB-D-2300145
The study investigated the use of Gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as a potential adsorbent for methyl orange (MO) textile dyes. However, there are some salient issues here that are not being addressed these are:

1. The abstract is lacking in the with clear problem statement that justifies this study in the first place
2. Since the research is centered on the use of adsorption techniques one would except to have salient recent research in adsorption treatment of textile effluent and the research gaps that necessitate the investigation of this adsorbent for adsorption studies.
3. The referencing style is inconsistent
4. There was not justification on as to why the modified Gaharu leaf extract was used (what is novel about this leaf extract?) and why magnetite knowing various studies have gone on these particular materials? How effective is this adsorbent as compared to the low-cost bio-waste that are often used as activated carbon, how cost effective and how feasible is this for the treatment of industrial dye effluent in a continuous system?
5. The study should clearly state how the modification improve the active sites of the adsorbent
6. There are lot of typo error in the article and some numbers are left hanging without SI unit e.g at section 2.3, and 2.4 50 what? Dried at 100 what? Kindly fix this.
7. The study only considered one factor as a basis of adsorption studies this looks too weak to establish the experimental condition for optimum adsorption process. The contact time, initial concentration, adsorbent dosage and effect of temperature should be considered and included before the work can be considered fit for adsorption studies
8. Also, the instrumental characterization for the adsorbents only presents the result, in-depth discussion should be given based on the characterization in relation to its use in adsorption
9. The research should also emphasize on the limitation of this studies.
10. Also, the overall write up requires a painstaking review on the typo errors and the English

Reviewer 2: The adsorbent that has been successfully synthesized shows quite good performance in adsorbing methyl orange. However, several things need to be considered and completed.
1. Abstract: A brief explanation should be added regarding the comparison of the performance results of M, MEDG and SDG as methyl orange adsorbents.
2. Introduction: There is no visible novelty in the research presented in this section. What are the advantages of gaharu leaf compared to other plants? Why is this research also conducting a study on M and SDG? Some of these questions need to be answered in the introduction.
3. Materials and methods: subchapter 2.5. it is necessary to add an explanation regarding the dispersing agent used in PSA testing. The type of dispersant used will affect the results. In this study, the particle size produced was still large.
4. Result: It is necessary to add characterization of the adsorbent after adsorption and after the reuse process
5. The KF value calculated from the Freundlich isotherm study shows that the KF value of MEDG is higher than M and SDG but does not show a significant difference between M, MEDG and SDG. A more complete explanation regarding this needs to be added. Connect this explanation with the results of kinetic studies that follow the Ho model with qe values M>SDG>MEDG.
6. Do the magnetization saturation values of M and MEDG (Figure 6) not affect their performance as adsorbents?
7. Graphic quality needs to be improved (figure 10). The graphic design needs to be revised, especially the use of colors, legends and connecting lines.
8. The reusability results need to be displayed in graphical form so that you can see how the adsorbent performs in each cycle. It is also necessary to add post-adsorbent characterization for each cycle. At least, post cycles 1 and 5 for MEDG and M. Cycles 1 and 3 for SDG.
9. Image quality 9 needs to be improved. The name of the compound does not need to be boxed. Add a brief explanation of the type of bonding that occurs in the image.



**2 attachments**

**WMB-Comments.docx**
14K

**Reviewer comments_WMB-D-23-00145.docx**
28K

# Decision on submission to Waste Management Bulletin

1 message

**Waste Management Bulletin** <em@editorialmanager.com> Sun, Dec 10, 2023 at 3:59 PM
Reply-To: Waste Management Bulletin <wmb@elsevier.com>
To: Triastuti Sulistyaningsih <triastuti.s@mail.unnes.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: WMB-D-23-00145

Green synthesis of gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as an adsorbent for methyl orange textile dyes

Dear Dr Sulistyaningsih,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Waste Management Bulletin.

I have completed my evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below. Please resubmit your revised manuscript by Jan 14, 2024.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed.

To submit your revised manuscript, please log in as an author at https://www.editorialmanager.com/wmb/, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

Waste Management Bulletin values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,
Antoni Sánchez
Co-Editors-in-Chief
Waste Management Bulletin

Editor and Reviewer comments:

Please explain in deep detail all your revisions.
Both reviewers have attached a document with revisions.

Reviewer 1: WMB-D-2300145
The study investigated the use of Gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as a potential adsorbent for methyl orange (MO) textile dyes. However, there are some salient issues here that are not being addressed these are:

1. The abstract is lacking in the with clear problem statement that justifies this study in the first place
2. Since the research is centered on the use of adsorption techniques one would except to have salient recent research in adsorption treatment of textile effluent and the research gaps that necessitate the investigation of this adsorbent for adsorption studies.
3. The referencing style is inconsistent
4. There was not justification on as to why the modified Gaharu leaf extract was used (what is novel about this leaf extract?) and why magnetite knowing various studies have gone on these particular materials? How effective is this adsorbent as compared to the low-cost bio-waste that are often used as activated carbon, how cost effective and how feasible is this for the treatment of industrial dye effluent in a continuous system?
5. The study should clearly state how the modification improve the active sites of the adsorbent
6. There are lot of typo error in the article and some numbers are left hanging without SI unit e.g at section 2.3, and 2.4 50 what? Dried at 100 what? Kindly fix this.
7. The study only considered one factor as a basis of adsorption studies this looks too weak to establish the experimental condition for optimum adsorption process. The contact time, initial concentration, adsorbent dosage and effect of temperature should be considered and included before the work can be considered fit for adsorption studies
8. Also, the instrumental characterization for the adsorbents only presents the result, in-depth discussion should be given based on the characterization in relation to its use in adsorption
9. The research should also emphasize on the limitation of this studies.
10. Also, the overall write up requires a painstaking review on the typo errors and the English

Reviewer 2: The adsorbent that has been successfully synthesized shows quite good performance in adsorbing methyl orange. However, several things need to be considered and completed.
1. Abstract: A brief explanation should be added regarding the comparison of the performance results of M, MEDG and SDG as methyl orange adsorbents.
2. Introduction: There is no visible novelty in the research presented in this section. What are the advantages of gaharu leaf compared to other plants? Why is this research also conducting a study on M and SDG? Some of these questions need to be answered in the introduction.
3. Materials and methods: subchapter 2.5. it is necessary to add an explanation regarding the dispersing agent used in PSA testing. The type of dispersant used will affect the results. In this study, the particle size produced was still large.
4. Result: It is necessary to add characterization of the adsorbent after adsorption and after the reuse process
5. The KF value calculated from the Freundlich isotherm study shows that the KF value of MEDG is higher than M and SDG but does not show a significant difference between M, MEDG and SDG. A more complete explanation regarding this needs to be added. Connect this explanation with the results of kinetic studies that follow the Ho model with qe values M>SDG>MEDG.
6. Do the magnetization saturation values of M and MEDG (Figure 6) not affect their performance as adsorbents?
7. Graphic quality needs to be improved (figure 10). The graphic design needs to be revised, especially the use of colors, legends and connecting lines.
8. The reusability results need to be displayed in graphical form so that you can see how the adsorbent performs in each cycle. It is also necessary to add post-adsorbent characterization for each cycle. At least, post cycles 1 and 5 for MEDG and M. Cycles 1 and 3 for SDG.
9. Image quality 9 needs to be improved. The name of the compound does not need to be boxed. Add a brief explanation of the type of bonding that occurs in the image.



**2 attachments**

**WMB-Comments.docx**
14K

**Reviewer comments_WMB-D-23-00145.docx**
28K

# Your Submission WMB-D-23-00145R2

1 message

**Waste Management Bulletin** <em@editorialmanager.com> Sun, Feb 4, 2024 at 12:21 AM
Reply-To: Waste Management Bulletin <wmb@elsevier.com>
To: Triastuti Sulistyaningsih <triastuti.s@mail.unnes.ac.id>

Ref.: Ms. No. **WMB-D-23-00145R2**
Green synthesis of gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as an adsorbent for methyl orange textile dyes
Waste Management Bulletin

Dear Dr Sulistyaningsih,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Waste Management Bulletin. Reviewer comments on your manuscript indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form. However, I invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript if you feel that you can suitably address the reviewers' comments included below.

If you submit a revised manuscript, please consider the reviewer's comments carefully.

To submit a revision, go to https://www.editorialmanager.com/wmb/ and log in as an Author where you will see a menu item called 'Submission Needing Revision'.

Please resubmit your manuscript by **Feb 17, 2024**.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Antoni Sánchez
Co-Editors-in-Chief
Waste Management Bulletin

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Please explain in detail your answers

Reviewer 1: The Abstract should be reworked on it too wordy and the overall Tense should be revised. Also, some the spacing between the SI unit and the Number should be reviewed. In general the English should be revised

Reviewer 2: Revisions accepted, manuscripts recommended for further processing. Thank you

Have questions or need assistance?
For further assistance, please visit our customer service site: http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/9435/. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

At Elsevier, we want to help all our authors to stay safe when publishing. Please be aware of fraudulent messages requesting money in return for the publication of your paper. If you are publishing open access with Elsevier, bear in mind that we will never request payment before the paper has been accepted. We have prepared some guidelines (https://www.elsevier.com/connect/authors-update/seven-top-tips-on-stopping-apc-scams ) that you may find helpful, including a short video on Identifying fake acceptance letters (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o5l8thD9XtE ). Please remember that you can contact Elsevier?s Researcher Support team (https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/) at any time if you have questions about your manuscript, and you can log into Editorial Manager to check the status of your manuscript (https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/29155/c/10530/supporthub/publishing/kw/status/).
#AU_WMB#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

---

**WMB-D-23-00145_R2_reviewer.pdf**
4996K

# Decision on submission to Waste Management Bulletin

1 message

**Waste Management Bulletin** <em@editorialmanager.com> Sat, Feb 17, 2024 at 11:11 PM
Reply-To: Waste Management Bulletin <wmb@elsevier.com>
To: Triastuti Sulistyaningsih <triastuti.s@mail.unnes.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: **WMB-D-23-00145R3**
Green synthesis of gaharu leaf extract-modified magnetite as an adsorbent for methyl orange textile dyes

Dear Dr Sulistyaningsih,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Waste Management Bulletin.

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication.

My comments, and any reviewer comments, are below.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. We will create a proof which you will be asked to check, and you will also be asked to complete a number of online forms required for publication. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact you directly.

We appreciate and value your contribution to Waste Management Bulletin. We regularly invite authors of recently published manuscript to participate in the peer review process. If you were not already part of the journal's reviewer pool, you have now been added to it.

We look forward to your continued participation in our journal, and we hope you will consider us again for future submissions.

Kind regards,
Antoni Sánchez
Co-Editors-in-Chief
Waste Management Bulletin

Editor and Reviewer comments:

More information and support

FAQ: When and how will I receive the proofs of my article?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/6007/p/10592/supporthub/publishing/related/

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?
https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/
For further assistance, please visit our customer service site: https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/
Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email
At Elsevier, we want to help all our authors to stay safe when publishing. Please be aware of fraudulent messages requesting money in return for the publication of your paper. If you are publishing open access with Elsevier, bear in mind that we will never request payment before the paper has been accepted. We have prepared some guidelines (https://www.elsevier.com/connect/authors-update/seven-top-tips-on-stopping-apc-scams ) that you may find helpful, including a short video on Identifying fake acceptance letters (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o5l8thD9XtE ). Please remember that you can contact Elsevier?s Researcher Support team (https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/) at any time if you have questions about your manuscript, and you can log into Editorial Manager to check the status of your manuscript (https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/29155/c/10530/supporthub/publishing/kw/status/).
#AU_WMB#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code