**List of comments of reviewers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comments of Reviewer**  | **Remarks** |
|  | **Reviewer-I** |  |
| 1 | In the paper there is no page nor line number to be corrected. | Inserted the page and line number to the file |
| 2 | The main disadvantage in the work is the lack of discussion related to the comparison of the obtained results with the results from the literature. It must be clearly shown to what extent the capacity values are comparable with the literature data. | The mentioned corrections were incorporated (the current data were discussed and compared with the previous literature) |
|  | **Reviewers-II** |  |
| 3 | The Introduction therefore needs more specific details about similar works already carried out, in order to give the authors opportunity to better express the novelty of their work. | In introduction literature related to biomass used for removal of Pb(II) were added  |
| 4 | Every part of the Results and Discussion section requires additional work, whereby wherever possible, the results presented are compared to the prior results of other authors. | The current data were discussed and compared with the previous literature |
| 5 | Title, elsewhere: The word 'Disinfection' is not an appropriate synonym for 'removal' or 'remediation'. | The mentioned correction was incorporated  |
| 6 | Units: The spacing and presentation of the units throughout the paper is very inconsistent, eg ln 100-107: '313K' vs '1073 K'; ln 142: '1 mg / L' instead of '1 mg/l'. | The mentioned correction was incorporated |
| 7 | Figures: I would prefer just a scatter plot for the data instead of a scatter plot with straight lines - the straight lines do not represent anything, and confuse the figures where a fitting line has been added. | The mentioned correction was incorporated |
| 8 | Kinetics fitting: The inclusion of the pseudo-first-order kinetics model in the supplementary data does not add anything to this paper - both the pseudo-first order and pseudo-second-order models are reaction kinetics models, and are not well suited to modeling kinetics systems. The pseudo-second-order basically always fits adsorption kinetics better thanthe first-order equation. | We apply the Pseudo 1st and 2nd order to only know whether the reaction is Pseudo 1st or 2nd order. And from that we can clue the clarify the Langmuir model  |
| 9 | It would be more interesting if, in addition the pseudo second order model, the authors used the Weber Morris model to elucidate the adsorption mechanisms | The mentioned correction was incorporated |
| 10 | I thought the thermodynamics data presented in the supplementary material was quite interesting, and would welcome a greater discussion about the significance of those results in the main body of the manuscript, with appropriate comparisons with the results of other authors. | Agreed, We added the thermodynamics data to the main file and it was interesting because it matched with the previous literature  |
| 11 | If possible, the entire manuscript would benefit from corrections by a native English speaker. | The manuscript was checked by English Fulbright scholar, working in USA |