

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Line 34 to 36: The author alleges that traditional water treatment listed generally have low degradation efficiency and.....making it difficult to degrade them effectively....Treatment technology such as membrane separation does not degrade pollutants but rather remove pollutants from wastewater, so listing membrane technology as one of the degrading process cannot be correct

Line 38 to 38: Water environmental pollution treatment...this line can better be rephrased "Wastewater treatment"

Line 46 to 47: The use of the hot topic again after being used in line 37 can perhaps be replaced with it has gained significant research attention or attracted researcher's attention

Line 53 to 54: What does low environmental conditions mean and how is it different for mild conditions?

This reviewer feels these two are referring to the same thing

Line 55 to 55: "...which has been widely used in various researchers"...whats the point of the part in the sentence?

Line 56 to 57: "The advanced oxidation technology is based on metal (15,16). It requires less energy. Why not merge the two sentences into The advanced oxidation technology is based on metal and it requires less energy.

Line 70 to 71: Ferrous sulfate heptahydrate is written with a capital letter F but all other chemicals with small letters, if there is no significant reason for this, this reviewer suggest that there be consistency.

Line 75 to 86: Because the authors are reporting on what was done when preparing the Co-nZVI/GAC, the tense should be past tense rather than present tense....example: The granular activated carbon was soaked in 5% HCl for 24 hours and washed with deionized water until the supernatant was clear and was dried in an oven at 105

Line 91 to 91: What was used to control the pH at 6?

Line 93 to 94: The authors are correctly presenting the paragraphs in past tense as they are reporting. But then this section is report in present tense

Line 123 and 133: In the text the image is referred to as "Fig" but in the label is labelled "Figure". Is that correct?

Line 124 to 125: Why not show SEM image of the GAC without the nano-zero valent iron and compare it to the one loaded?

Line 126 to 126: Fig 1 is referred to as “Fig” and then the second image as “Figure” ... why not be consistent?

Line 139 to 139: Also, image 3 is referred to as “Fig”

Line 137, 147 and 178: All those figures are labelled “Figure 3” ... is that correct?

Line 185 to 186: The R^2 can be corrected to R^2

Line 281 to 335: The reference list from number 2 seems to be double numbered