



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8785
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparison of Soda and Soda-ethanol Pulps from <i>Thaumatococcus daniellii</i> Benth (Miraculous Berry) Stalks
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	A. Based on the "2.1. Pulping Experiment" in which the composition of the pulping liquors is explained, it is not clear that the data presented in Table 1 are correct (did the cooking liquor contain 40% ethanol or ethanol was 40% originally and the ethanol % in liquor was less than 40%); p.3. lines 75-76, Table 1. B. 2.1. Pulping experiment: Why were pulps not screened for the screened pulp yield and the yield of reject? Accordingly, kappa number should have been analysed on the screened pulps. C.2.2. Pulp bleaching, Table 2. Bleaching response and corresponding discussion of bleaching results should be explained in more detail: differences in kappa factors shown in Table 2 for example D. Tensile index (TI) and breaking length (BL) are dependent parameters as well as apparent density and bulk. While authors may report all of the values in the Table 3, they must make sure that the valid relationships between the parameters are reflected in their values. Authors should select either TI or BL and either apparent density or bulk to report in Figures i.e. remove either Figure 2 or 3 and remove either Figure 6 or 7. E. Authors claim on page 4. "hence 150 °C was selected as its optimum cooking temperature." Based on this it is still not clear if in the continuation of the study processing (bleaching and refining) and analyses were performed only on the soda and soda ethanol	A. Soda-ethanol pulping liquor container equal volume of 12% NaOH solution and 40%/60% ethanol-water solution. See the section 2.1 (line 79-84) for detail. B. the pulps were screened as explained in section 2.1 (line 87-92). The values presented in Table 1 were based on screened pulp yield. Same with kappa number. However, fluffy nature of the pulp fibres and difficulty involved in its screening particularly at 140 and 160 °C, the analysis of the rejects was not carried out. C. This suggestion had been addressed in section 3.2.1. D. This suggestions had been addressed. Figures 2 (bulk) and 7 (breaking length) as suggested has been deleted while those of apparent sheet density and tensile index were retained. E. As explained in sections 2.2 and 3.1, based on the screened yields and their corresponding kappa numbers, 150 °C was selected as the optimum cooking temperature for <i>T. Danielle</i> stalks. Therefore, only pulps obtained at this



SDI Review Form 1.6

	pulps produced at 150C.	temperature was used for bleaching and refining experiments. See line 96-97 and 159-160
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A. p.4. lines 128-129 contain a claim on physical properties of pulps while they have not been discussed in the previous text Bengalis should be polished (for example: p.5. line 171 "had to be beating" but this is not the only instant where correction is necessary) C. Typos should be corrected (e.g. p.11 ref. #21. Line 361 "vugaris"	A. The authors discussed the screened yields and kappa number of both pulp types in that section (now in line 149-152). While the Authors acknowledged other physical properties can be discussed. It must be pointed out that the screened yield, Kappa number and pulp sheet brightness investigated in this study fall under physical properties of the pulp. B and C. The errors pointed out were acknowledged and have been corrected. E.g., the correct word is beaten (line 200) and not beating. Also, vugaris have been corrected to vulgaris (now in line 345).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		