



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Dyes and Pigments

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/dyepig

Editorial

Since the on-line submission system for Dyes and Pigments came into operation almost two years ago, of those papers that were reviewed and for which a decision made, a little over 60% concerned *dye removal* (via adsorption/degradation) and associated *sorbent synthesis and preparation*. This very high proportion of submitted dye removal articles clearly reflects the importance of dye removal as a subject of study; that such papers were received from authors around the globe also shows that dye removal research is truly of worldwide interest. However, of this very large number of submitted dye removal manuscripts, an alarmingly high proportion were deemed unacceptable for publication. Indeed, in terms of the breakdown between accepted and rejected papers, of the above mentioned papers for which a decision was made and which concerned dye removal, only 8% were accepted and 92% were rejected. This rejection rate is considerably higher than that enjoyed by the other subject areas covered in the journal (e.g. dye synthesis, pigments and intermediates, their physical or chemical properties, etc.).

Although the rejection of manuscripts is, unfortunately, both necessary and unavoidable for any peer-reviewed publication, the very high proportion of these dye removal manuscripts being rejected warrants attention. The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that the trend towards a high submission of dye removal papers seems set to continue, insofar as of the submitted papers currently under review, some 60% concern dye removal.

Having read all submitted papers as well as all reviewers' comments, it is clear that the rejected dye removal manuscripts have several common features and are remarkably similar in their presentation and organisation. Typical, commonly repeated reviewers' comments include the observations that:

- many authors are not familiar with dye usage, dye classification and the concept of C.I. Generic Name;
- a reasoned argument was not put forward as to why a particular dye was selected for study;
- old, commercially unimportant (commonly cationic) dyes have been selected for study;
- authors do not recognise that real dye wastewater is often a complex mixture of dyes, proprietary dyeing additives, electrolytes, etc. and that the use of an aqueous (often distilled water) solution of one dye does not mimic the conditions likely to be encountered in real waste water;
- many authors do not realise that as many commercial dyes are mixtures of dyes and diluents, multi-solute adsorption may arise;
- whilst optimum conditions for adsorbent preparation are claimed, these often are far from optimised;
- although traditional sorbent characterisation techniques are used, the characterisation results are not related to sorbent performance;
- adsorption experiments invariably record the effect of pH, adsorbent concentration, temperature, contact time, etc.;
- equilibrium data have been correlated only with conventional isotherm expressions (Freundlich and Langmuir, with a few others);
- kinetic data have been analysed along conventional lines;
- the results obtained using one dye on one adsorbent do not constitute a mechanism that is applicable to all similar types of dye on similar types of adsorbent;

The reason for writing this editorial is not to discourage people from carrying out dye removal studies and submitting their results to *Dyes and Pigments* for publication; indeed, because of its intrinsic environmental and economic importance, dye removal is of significant importance and I look forward to receiving well-prepared manuscripts on this subject. However, I wanted to bring to the attention of readers of the Journal and especially to individuals engaged in dye removal studies, the reasons for the comparatively low number of published papers that concern dye removal.