BUKTI KORESPONDENSI

Comments for the Editor

Close Panel

Participants *Edit*

- Smujo Editors (editors)
- Qadar Hasani (masqod)

Messages

Note	From
Dear Editor We previously submitted this manuscript to Biodiversitas on November 13th, 2020, and was declared declined because there was no response from reviewers. We re-send this manuscript to Biodiversitas with various improvements and enhancements which include: fixing / adding data in the form of graphics and images; repair and refinement of results and discussion; recent additions and references in the field of phytoremediation; and repair of citations using Mendeley. We also send a list of prospective reviewers who are competent in the field of water quality remediation, and already have a Scopus ID, who are willing to review our manuscript. They are: 1. Piyush Kumar, Department of Zoology and Environmental Science, Agroecology and Pollution ResearchLaboratory, Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand 249404, India. Email: piyushkumar@gkv.ac.in and kumarpiyushgkv@gmail.com 2. Nuning Vita Hidayati, Laboratory of Water Quality, Department of Fisheries and Marine Sciences, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto. Indonesia. Email: nuningvh@gmail.com	masqod 2020-11-13 06:54 AM

Note	From

3. Ahmad Muhtadi, Department of Aquatic Resources Management, Agricultural University, University of Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia. Email: muhtadi@usu.ac.id
4. Tolu Olufunmilayo Ajayi, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos State, Nigeria. Email: tajayi@unilag.edu.ng
5. Forcep Rio Indaryanto, Department of Fisheries, Faculty of Agriculture, Tirtayasa University, Indonesia. Email: for_cf@yahoo.com

We hope the editors are willing to process and receive our manuscript.

Best Regards

Qadar Hasani

Author

[biodiv] Submission Acknowledgement

External

Inbox

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <smujo.id@gmail.com> Fri, Nov 13, 2020, 2:11 PM

to me

Qadar Hasani:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms): Iron phythoremediation by Eichhornia crassipes " to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Submission URL: https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/7131

Username: masqod

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

External

Inbox

Nor Liza <smujo.id@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 8, 2020, 8:25 AM

to me

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "Reviewer" regarding the submission "Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms)".

Link: https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/7131

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

[biodiv] Submission Acknowledgement

External

Inbox

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <smujo.id@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 23, 2020, 1:35 PM

to me

Qadar Hasani:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms): Iron phythoremediation by Eichhornia crassipes " to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Submission URL: https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/7476
Username: masqod

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

[biodiv] Editor Decision

External

Inbox

Agustina Putri <smujo.id@gmail.com> Thu, Jan 7, 2021, 9:03 PM

to me

Qadar Hasani:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms): Iron phythoremediation by Eichhornia crassipes ".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Agustina Putri
sectioneditor4@smujo.id

Reviewer C:

Technically and in content, this manuscript is worthy of acceptance. Some just need improvement in the references and introductions

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer F:

Hasani et al. evaluated the capacity of water hyacinth to remediate ex-sand mining water contaminated with Fe. In general, this kind of study is no longer interesting because there are lots of similar studies in the literature already, which tend to show that water hyacinth is a good candidate for phytoremediation. As such, I cannot see any novelty of this work in terms of science. The only thing that may have some interest is the density effect. The authors should emphasize it more and explain why it is important. Apart from just providing the data of concentration, accumulation and translocation that have already been widely reported, the authors should discuss the applicability of using water hyacinth for phytoremediation. The discussion is very dull because it is not much different from citing and confirming the conclusion of previous studies. The authors did not proofread the manuscript before submission and there are lots of mistakes in the writing. The authors need to revise the manuscript substantially, especially the development of research gap.

L31-40: Poorly written sentence. This is my first time to see a sentence with over 100 words!

L41-47: If these metals are commonly found, why only studied Fe?

L50-57: It is unnecessary to list all the methods for Fe removal, which are irrelevant to this study.

L61-73: If many studies have shown the good capacity of water hyacinth to remove metals, what is the point to conduct this study? What is the originality? As mentioned above, density effect may have some interest, which should be justified.

L88-91: The number of replicates must be mentioned.

L93: Looks repetitive.

L106: Details of quality control are needed, such as methods, recovery, precision, etc.

L159-160: These sentences are repetitive and not very meaningful.

L177: Please note that Cl is not a metal. More recent references are needed to support this sentence (e.g. Jones et al., 2018; Eid et al., 2019; Du et al., 2020).

Du et al. 2020. Accumulation and translocation of heavy metals in water hyacinth: Maximising the use of green resources to remediate sites impacted by e-waste recycling activities. Ecol. Indic. 115, 106384.

Eid et al. 2019. Bioaccumulation and translocation of nine heavy metals by Eichhornia crassipes in Nile Delta, Egypt: perspectives for phytoremediation. Int. J. Phytoremediation 21, 821-830.

Jones et al. 2018. Extending the geographic reach of the water hyacinth plant in removal of heavy metals from a temperate Northern Hemisphere river. Sci. Rep. 8, 11071.

L187-192: Foreign language. No author proofread the manuscript before submission…...

Fig. 4: Need to explain the unexpected higher concentration in the “75%” treatment, which should be labelled “D” not “C”. Check throughout.

L250-264: Nutrient is not the focus of this work and these paragraphs should be condensed.

L268-272: This explanation is not convincing because the morphology of leaves and stems is the same across treatments. The difference is more likely driven by the physiology of plants.

L293-297: Whether the plant is a good candidate also depends on its tolerance to the toxicity of metals.

L301-304: This statement looks contradictory to the overall message of this work and should be revised to bring optimism. The authors should provide solutions to solve the issues regarding applicability. On the other hand, how to deal with the plant litter after phytoremediation is another concern, but I cannot see this discussion. A recent study by Du et al. (2020) has proposed a method for that. Please add relevant information to enrich the discussion.

Du et al. 2020. Accumulation and translocation of heavy metals in water hyacinth: Maximising the use of green resources to remediate sites impacted by e-waste recycling activities. Ecol. Indic. 115, 106384.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

One attachment • Scanned by Gmail

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com> Thu, Jan 7, 2021, 9:47 PM

to me

Qadar Hasani:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms): Iron phythoremediation by Eichhornia crassipes ".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Note: Kindly send your revised paper to professional proofreader prior to resubmission. A Certificate of Proofreading is needed.

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

One attachment • Scanned by Gmail

QADAR HASANI <masqod@fp.unila.ac.id> Fri, Jan 8, 2021, 10:19 AM

to Smujo

Dear Editor

Thank you for the information.
We are very excited about the decision of our manuscript from the Biodiversitas editor.

We will improve our manuscript according to the suggestions from reviewers, as soon as possible, and resend to the Biodiversitas.

Thank you for processing and considering our manuscript.

Best regards

Qadar Hasani
Main Author

[biodiv] Editor Decision

Inbox

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com> Wed, Jan 13, 2021, 10:52 PM

to me

Qadar Hasani:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms): Iron phythoremediation by Eichhornia crassipes ".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

Reviewer C:

Technically and in content, this manuscript is worthy of acceptance. Some just need improvement in the references and introductions

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer F:

Hasani et al. evaluated the capacity of water hyacinth to remediate ex-sand mining water contaminated with Fe. In general, this kind of study is no longer interesting because there are lots of similar studies in the literature already, which tend to show that water hyacinth is a good candidate for phytoremediation. As such, I cannot see any novelty of this work in terms of science. The only thing that may have some interest is the density effect. The authors should emphasize it more and explain why it is important. Apart from just providing the data of concentration, accumulation and translocation that have already been widely reported, the authors should discuss the applicability of using water hyacinth for phytoremediation. The discussion is very dull because it is not much different from citing and confirming the conclusion of previous studies. The authors did not proofread the manuscript before submission and there are lots of mistakes in the writing. The authors need to revise the manuscript substantially, especially the development of research gap.

L31-40: Poorly written sentence. This is my first time to see a sentence with over 100 words!

L41-47: If these metals are commonly found, why only studied Fe?

L50-57: It is unnecessary to list all the methods for Fe removal, which are irrelevant to this study.

L61-73: If many studies have shown the good capacity of water hyacinth to remove metals, what is the point to conduct this study? What is the originality? As mentioned above, density effect may have some interest, which should be justified.

L88-91: The number of replicates must be mentioned.

L93: Looks repetitive.

L106: Details of quality control are needed, such as methods, recovery, precision, etc.

L159-160: These sentences are repetitive and not very meaningful.

L177: Please note that Cl is not a metal. More recent references are needed to support this sentence (e.g. Jones et al., 2018; Eid et al., 2019; Du et al., 2020).

Du et al. 2020. Accumulation and translocation of heavy metals in water hyacinth: Maximising the use of green resources to remediate sites impacted by e-waste recycling activities. Ecol. Indic. 115, 106384.

Eid et al. 2019. Bioaccumulation and translocation of nine heavy metals by Eichhornia crassipes in Nile Delta, Egypt: perspectives for phytoremediation. Int. J. Phytoremediation 21, 821-830.

Jones et al. 2018. Extending the geographic reach of the water hyacinth plant in removal of heavy metals from a temperate Northern Hemisphere river. Sci. Rep. 8, 11071.

L187-192: Foreign language. No author proofread the manuscript before submission…...

Fig. 4: Need to explain the unexpected higher concentration in the “75%” treatment, which should be labelled “D” not “C”. Check throughout.

L250-264: Nutrient is not the focus of this work and these paragraphs should be condensed.

L268-272: This explanation is not convincing because the morphology of leaves and stems is the same across treatments. The difference is more likely driven by the physiology of plants.

L293-297: Whether the plant is a good candidate also depends on its tolerance to the toxicity of metals.

L301-304: This statement looks contradictory to the overall message of this work and should be revised to bring optimism. The authors should provide solutions to solve the issues regarding applicability. On the other hand, how to deal with the plant litter after phytoremediation is another concern, but I cannot see this discussion. A recent study by Du et al. (2020) has proposed a method for that. Please add relevant information to enrich the discussion.

Du et al. 2020. Accumulation and translocation of heavy metals in water hyacinth: Maximising the use of green resources to remediate sites impacted by e-waste recycling activities. Ecol. Indic. 115, 106384.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer I:

Manuscript title: The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms*): Iron phythoremediation by *Eichhornia crassipes*

General comments:-

1. Proofreading need to be conducted for the whole manuscript. There are significant numbers of error in grammar and structure of sentence in the text.
2. Revise the format for in-text citation. There are some unnecessary additional parentheses.
3. Be synchronize for the usage of 'iron (Fe)' word in the whole text. Authors can just use 'Fe' throughout the manuscript after mentioning in it full for the first time in the abstract.
4. Be uniform in the usage of comma (,) and dot (.) for the numbering system. Usage of this symbols to represent decimals and thousand in the text are not consistent. Advised to use dot for decimal and comma for thousand.
5. There are a paragraph written in Indonesian. Need to be translated to English.

Specific comments:-

Abstract

- Please revise on the usage of word 'puddles'. Is it an appropriate representation? In materials and methods part, it was mentioned as lake (more suitable word).
- Please add explanation on authors research's objectives and themes (treating ex-sand mining water to acceptable limit for aquaculture usage) in early part of the abstract to orientate reader on the purpose of the research.

Introduction

- Line 43-46: Recommended to change the structure of whole sentence to 'Fe can be found in the forms of black colored magnetite (Fe_3O_4) and ilmenite ($FeTiO_3$), also red colored hematite and maghemite (Fe_2O_3) compounds.
- Line 69-70: Relocate and combine the statements on variety of heavy metals that can be treated by water hyacinth to the statement in line 62-63. Examples of recommended change is 'Water hyacinth has been proven to be effective and efficient in reducing variety of heavy metals such as Ca, Mg, Cl and SO_4 and PO_4 including Fe which will be focused in this study.

*please provide full name for first-time mentioned metals

- Line 70-71: 'Based on several … in the waters'. No need. It is a repetition of statement in line 62-63

Materials and methods

- Line 86: '…clean water then dried using??'. Please state method of drying. Sun drying?
- Line 87-88: Recommended to delete statement 'Measurement of Fe … beginning before treatment'. Enough with similar explanation in the section of *Water quality measurement*.
- Line 94: Please specify the average size of plants used
- Line 112-113: Delete repetition of statement 'Fe concentration measurements were done once a week'. Already mentioned in earlier subsection.
- Line 124-125: Please include brief explanation on the digestion method. Such as sample's weight, type and concentration of acid used.
- Line 124: '…concentration of Fe in roots, stems and leaves by the Atomic…'
- Line 127: The formula is not so clear. Please specifically indicate which concentration involved in the calculation such as 'final metal concentration in plant (which part? Addition of stem and leaves?)', 'final metal concentration in water'.

Results and discussion

- Line 155: Should be 'Figure 2'
- Figure 1 and 2: Recommended to combine these two figures since it is basically same information. Figure 3 which involves data on Fe removal can also be combined in the same graph if it suits authors preference. Example of figures suggested can be found in below manuscript (Figure 3 and above).

Manuscript DOI: 10.1016/j.eti.2019.100502

- Figure 1: Change the x-axis label to clearer axis title. Example: Days of treatment/exposure.
- Figure 2: Error in axis labelling (treatment D was mistyped as C)
- Line 153: 'Graph of Fe removal in water from ex-sand mining lake? for 21 days of experiment'
- Line 157: More suitable to mention figure 3 at early explanation '…and 94.84%, respectively (Figure 3)' and delete it from line 169-170.
- Line 157-159: It is confusing to mention this statement ('Based on the … differences ($p>0.05$)') here since there is no proper explanation on the significance and relationship of this analysis. I found similar statement was well explained in discussion section, so I suggest to remove this statement here.
- Line 159-161: 'This shows that the different treatment of water hyacinth cover area has an effect on decreasing Fe concentration in water. These results indicate that the different treatment of water hyacinth coverage has an effect on decreasing the concentration of Fe in water'. These two sentences are repetition of similar statement. Delete either one.
- Figure 3: What does small letter a,b,c, in each last bar means? Significant difference? Please mention in the caption
- Line 179: 'study by Rondonuwu (2014), that water hyacinth was able to reduce mercury (Hg) by 81.19%'. This study is on other metal. Please prioritize study of similar metal first. No need to put or place it in the end of the comparison.
- Table 1: Be uniform in numbering format for the decimals (comma/dot)
- Line 187-192: Please translate the text in Indonesian to English!

- Line 197-198: ‘so that it is not available for absorption by plants’. Similar statement mentioned in earlier sentence (line 195-196). Consider combining the information in one sentence and don’t repeat similar explanation.
- Line 199: Please include brief explanation on decrement/increment of nitrate/phosphate/ammonia concentration at the end of the section before being explained in discussion section as other water quality parameter.
- Line 200: suggested to change title to ‘Uptake of Fe by water hyacinth’.
- Line 212-213: Recheck if this statement ‘This condition occurs because the initial concentration of Fe in water is also the lowest’ is valid. Because from my observation, percentage difference of initial metal concentration between the treatments is not that big as the difference for the final concentration.
- Table 2: Please specify detailed explanation on the letter notation in note below the table. State significance different between what and what.
- Line 227-228: ‘Treatment C was not significantly different from treatment C because, in treatment D, Fe was only’. Recheck for mistyped letter for type of treatment.
- Line 237-238: Repetition of statement ‘The low pH value occurs due to the influence of a high population of water hyacinth’.
- Line 238-240: So, in this study, is there any significance contribution of respected factors mentioned in the statement to the study results?
- Line 257-264: This paragraph only explains on nitrate and ammonia. What about increment in phosphate concentration in all treatment after 21 days? Is there any reason for that?
- Line 268-270: These two sentences mention similar thing. Delete either one.
- Line 293-295: Similar sentences found in next paragraph. Please delete this one.
- Line 302-303: Be uniform in bulleting format. Italic or Arabic number.

Line 298-308: Consider to make separate of ‘Conclusion’ for this statements.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

External

Inbox

DEWI NUR PRATIWI <smujo.id@gmail.com> Mon, Jan 18, 2021, 2:04 PM

to me

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "Uncorrected Proof" regarding the submission "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms)".

Link: https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/7476

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

DEWI NUR PRATIWI <smujo.id@gmail.com> Mon, Jan 18, 2021, 2:08 PM

to me

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "BILLING" regarding the submission "The Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms)".

Q

QADAR HASANI <masqod@fp.unila.ac.id> Tue, Jan 19, 2021, 3:54 PM

to DEWI, Ahmad, finance, unsjournals

Dear

Editor

We are delighted that our manuscript was accepted for publication at Biodiversity.
We send a "corrected Proof" of our manuscipt entitled "Phytoremediation of Iron (Fe) in Ex-sand Mining Waters by Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms)".
We have added some changes/improvements to the manuscript.
We hereby send proof of payment for the manuscript publication.
Thank you for agreeing to publish our manuscript.

Best regards

Qadar Hasani,
Main author

biodiv] Editor Decision

Inbox

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com> Thu, Jan 21, 2021, 1:53 PM

to me

QADAR HASANI, NIKEN T.M. PRATIWI, YUSLI WARDIATNO, HEFNI EFFENDI, ARTHO NUGRAHA MARTIN, PURNA PIRDAUS, WAGIRAN:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "Phytoremediation of iron in ex-sand mining waters by water hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes)".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com> Thu, Jan 21, 2021, 2:14 PM

to me,

QADAR HASANI, NIKEN T.M. PRATIWI, YUSLI WARDIATNO, HEFNI EFFENDI, ARTHO NUGRAHA MARTIN, PURNA PIRDAUS, WAGIRAN:

The editing of your submission, "Phytoremediation of iron in ex-sand mining waters by

water hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes)," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/7476

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

Q

QADAR HASANI <masqod@fp.unila.ac.id> Fri, Jan 22, 2021, 7:33 AM

to Smujo

Dear
Smujo Editor

We are very excited to receive our manuscript on The Biodiversitas.

Thank you for accepting and publishing our manuscript.
We hope to send more of our manuscripts to The Biodiversitas in the future.

Best regards

Qadar Hasani
Main author
