|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEWER A** |  |  |
| **S.NO.** | **SUGGESTION** | **CHANGES IN DETAIL** |
|  | Authors should be emphasized what is the difference of this study from those reported in the literature. | A statement of importance has been added in line 46 |
|  | In addition, the English mistakes should be checked carefully as seen in below.  | The manuscript has been checked thoroughly and the mentioned mistakes have been rectified. |
|  | The quality of figures should be improved. Results should be compared and discussed with literature.  | * The clarity and quality of all the figures has been improved.
* Results have been compared and presented in a tabular form as Table II.....
* TABLE OF COMPARISON SENT AS SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL MENTIONING THE PAPER, AUTHORS FOR THE SAME DYE, ADSORBENTS USED AND ADSORPTION CAPACITY.
 |
| 4. | In the title and text, initial letter of “Tartrazine” should be  lower-case letter, which is not special name | The initial letter of tartrazine has been changed to lower case in the entire text as suggested. |
| 5 | Page2  line 36- In “adsorbents. and”, point should be omitted. | Mentioned change has been made. Full stop “.” is deleted  |
| 6. | Page 2 line 38- The sentence “Acid doped PANI successfully used by researchers for removal of anionic dyes” should be passive  | The sentence has been made passive. |
| 7. | Page 3- line 43,  “ at in “at  determining” should be omitted.  | Suggested changes have been made. |
| 8. | …”× …” should be “kept  at 9 × | Page3 line 65-The change has been incorporated as : The concentration of solutions was kept at 9 ×10-5M |
| 9. | Equation 8 should be  “ wrong.  | We request to disagree as the mentioned equation has been taken from the papers of eminent authors(Khamparia et al. 2017; Jaspal et al.2009) |
| 10 | The quality of Figures 3 and 4 should be improved. | The mentioned figures have been improved in quality. |
| 11. | Page5 line 127,128- Totally unclear. Please explain it more clear and precise | Suggested change has been made. |
| 12. | Page 8- line 159-“ adsorbent 30 °C “should be “adsorbent at  30 °C”. Here authors have discussed the influence of adsorbent dosage on dye removal and mutual influence of adsorbent dosage and temperature which is not presented in the Figures. it seems that there is an error in units for amount of adsorbed dye.Also, from the presented graphs it is unclear how amount of adsorbed dye ranged up to 164.1 when the max on the y axis was 120 - 130 | Fig.3b shows amount adsorbed at 30 °C. As temperature increases from 30- 50°C maximum amount of dye adsorbed ranged from 110.8 to 164.1× 10-5 g . Since the graph is shown at a lower temperature therefore the higher value is not shown and only put in text. |
| 13. | Page 8- line 168 “at 2 pH and dye concentration 9 “should be either” at  pH 2 and dye concentration at 9…” or “ at 2 of pH and dye concentration at 9” | Mentioned suggestion has been incorporated. |
| 14. | Page 8 line 172, the comparison of result with Dogan et al should be writtenin detail.  | A description and mention of the study carried out by Dogan et al. has been written. |
|  | Page 9- line 189 “As per” should be “as for” | Page 9- line 189-As for Freundlich studies the values of *K*F allied with adsorption intensity |
| **REVIEWER B** |  |  |
| **S.NO.** | **SUGGESTION** | **CHANGES IN DETAIL** |
|  |  |  |
|  | Check English language again very carefully. | The manuscript has been thoroughly checked for grammatical mistakes. |
|  | Explain all used abbreviation when they appear in the text for the firsttime. | Suggested changes have been made. |
|  | Correct the Manuscript in accordance with the attached pdf document ofreviewed manuscript. | We have corrected the manuscript in accordance with reviewed manuscript  |
|  | Most important: Since (as the authors mentioned in the Introduction part)different kind of polymers, their derivatives and doped polymers werealready widely used as an alternative for commercial activated carbon inpurification of water polluted with Tartrazine, it is essential that theauthors compare their results with the results found in the literature forremoval of tartrazine using different kind of adsorbent. Also, comparison ofobtained results with the one obtained on activated carbon will prove thatthe used doped polyaniline is valid alternative for commercial adsorbent. | A comparison, as mentioned has been drawn and presented in the form of a table. Table II |
|  |  |  |