



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_6575
Title of the Manuscript:	CURE CHARACTERISTICS AND RHEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF MODIFIED KAOLIN - NATURAL RUBBER VULCANIZATES
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT: - Line 1: infers that RSO-Na was modified, which is incorrect as it is the kaolin rather that was modified (section 2.2). - Line 2: suggest re-writing to read'...mixed with various compositions of pristine and modified kaolin (2-10 parts...) INTRODUCTION: - The paper title bears reference neither to nanoparticles nor nanocomposites. Thus, beginning the 'Introduction' on that note is incongruous to the title of paper. - The author(s) should have first undertaken a review on the use of kaolin, highlighting the shortcomings, in order to justify the need to use modified kaolin. - No sufficient argument to convince reader that use of RSO-Na on kaolin will convert it to nanoparticles as inferred in the paper. Related literature suggesting this possibility need to have been provided. - Text references using Author/year and number bracket simultaneously is wrong format, e.g section 3.2 line 7 'Blow, 1971 [24]' should have been 'Blow (1971)' or '[24]'. Similar errors in the text to be corrected. THUS ABSTRACT & INTRODUCTION SHOULD BE MODIFIED ACCORDINGLY. EXPERIMENTAL:	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. Section 2.1 line 2: Not clear.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	EXPERIMENTAL Section 2.2 line 1: 'contacting' to be replaced by 'reacting'. 'Compounding' (section 2.4) should come before 'Characterization' (section 2.3). - Table 1: Title is misleading. It should have read thus: 'Formulation ingredients for pristine kaolin-filled and modified kaolin-filled NR composites'. - It should made interesting reading to include tensile properties and SEM/TEM analyses of the composites as is conventional of studies of this nature. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS: - Figure 1: The IR spectrum for 'B' is unclear. Image resolution is very poor and illegible! Section 3.3: It is wrongly stated that RSO-Na is modified (Lines 2, 8-10), whereas it is the kaolin that was supposed to have been modified. These should be corrected.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	'et al,' should always be in italics as '<i>et al.</i>'. - Reference list should be made to conform to Journal format.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stephen Shaibu Ochigbo
Department, University & Country	Department of Chemistry, Federal University of Technology, P.M.B. 65 Minna, Nigeria