

- The description of the material and method is ambiguous. For instance, for graphene material synthesis the size of precursor is very important. However, the authors merely mentioned “fine particles” and doesn’t provide detailed information about graphite.
- Authors should include Raman spectroscopy of their synthesized materials as well as its size distribution. This would be important since they used very high centrifugation rpm 15000 to remove exfoliated from unexfoliated graphite, and I assume they should get pretty small definitely submicron particles.
- The author should also report Raman spectroscopy of their synthesized materials, because it can show the number of layers and also size and defects in their structure.
- Authors provided AFM profile of their material but they didn’t provide which flake they did the measurement on.
- The authors mentioned they did the XPS spectroscopy on single-layer graphene and represent the high resolution C1s for this. XPS analysis can be done on powder or films at least with couple of micrometer thickness. I wonder how they manage to perform XPS on single layers.
- To find C/O ratio from C1s high resolution XPS is an ambiguous practice. Authors should include survey spectrum of their samples and measure C/O ratio from it.
- Authors should edit image 2-d because it is assigned as “a”.
- The authors should present tabulated results of their ICP-OES analysis.
- Figure 2-c scale is not visible.
- Authors claimed to measure WCA for their samples but they didn’t include any images of their samples.

Owing to high level of ambiguity of experimental procedure and data representation, I reject the paper in following format. Although , they presented interesting data for their membrane ,but their characterization and experimental works should be revised significantly.