



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15581
Title of the Manuscript:	Properties of Particleboard Manufactured From Commonly Used Bamboo (Bambosa Vulgaris) Wastes in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please, review English language and grammar. Some mistakes on text should be correct.</p> <p>Figures and tables has the same information, you have to choose, one or other, I think the table with standard deviation is more informative, if you prefer figures, please change scale, so we can see standard deviation in them, principally in density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please correct the scientific name in all text: <i>Bambusa vulgaris</i> - Page 1, line 25 - ... wood grass and belongs to - Page 1, line 26-27- rewrite the sentence: Bamboo is a renewable raw material, universally accepted for building construction - Page 2, line 38 : Page 5 – lines 133 and 134: , page 6 -line 171, page 7 – line 185: Please correct the scientific name: <i>Bambusa vulgaris</i> - Page 2, line 39: please detail the chipper - Page 2, table 1 – please insert standard deviation on values. - Page 3 – line 91-92, Page4- lines 112-113;Page 5 – lines 130-131: the results are on table 1, it is not necessary write them, only discuss and comment - Page 3 – line 97-99. There is something wrong. The citation does not confirm the information. Cellulose content is not the responsible for high density. Please change the discussion. - Line 144, 164 – linear not liner 	<p>We have corrected the manuscript accordingly.</p> <p>We do agree with the reviewer. We have changed the tables for showing statistical analysis.</p> <p>We have corrected it accordingly.</p> <p>We have added it accordingly. We have rewritten the sentence accordingly.</p> <p>We have done it accordingly.</p> <p>We have done it accordingly. We have inserted it accordingly.</p> <p>We have eliminated the extra portion accordingly.</p> <p>We have corrected the discussion accordingly.</p> <p>We have corrected it accordingly.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Branch, not brunch in many words	We have corrected it accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is interesting, but it would be interesting a comment in introduction about local importance of the bamboo and the study, or some information about percentage of bamboo and its wastes in the region.</p> <p>In discussion, other authors could be added with results of some panels produced with different local material and other authors about bamboo. (ex: Melo et al. 2014 – Materials Research v.17, n.3 - http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1516-14392014005000052</p> <p>Papadopoulos et al 2004. Holz Roh Werkst (2004) 62:36–39 DOI 10.1007/s00107-003-0447-9</p> <p>Biswas et al 2011. doi:10.1016/j.ijadhadh.2010.11.006, etc.</p>	<p>We have added all the suitable information accordingly.</p> <p>We have added it accordingly. We have used relevant references need for the manuscript.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is simple, but compares some properties of bamboo particleboards, an information necessary to the development of industry.	We have added the information accordingly.