



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_12459
Title of the Manuscript:	LIQUID LAUNDRY DETERGENTS BASED ON NOVEL POLYMERIC SURFACTANTS
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors must include in the text all the characterizations and evaluations carried out. It is not enough to merely say, "ACCORDING TO STANDARD METHODS" Authors claim to have compared their novel polymers with commercial detergents whereas there is no evidence in the text where this was done. The authors need to make consultations on how to report research findings. It is curious for the authors to be making one sentence paragraphs. This is wrong!	Introduced stalagmometer for surface tension, reflectometer for detergency checking, density bottle for density, Cylinder for foam height measurement. In table 4 and 5. In result and discussion section. Sorry
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	11-12: This polymer has been used as a 70-90% replacement of conventional linear alkyl benzene sulphonate in liquid detergent formulations. Where has it been used? If it has been used elsewhere then why claim it is novel? Review your statement and see if you need to reframe it. 49: Temperature should be written in full	Corrected Written



SDI Review Form 1.6

	53: Measured or weighed? 83: Flow time is not viscosity. Viscosity is measured in poise or mpas Tables 1 and 2 should be revisited and properly organized 130: What do EX, G and P mean?	Weighed Arranged properly. Ex- excellent, G-Good, p- poor.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is poorly written. The Result and Discussion session are too scanty. I must comment that the authors did some reasonable work, but they were unable to articulate salient points for convincing and robust discussion. The deficiencies in the Methodologies must be addressed. The Discussion must be improved upon. Syntax and grammatical errors should be addressed. If these are not done then the manuscript is not worth being published.	Ok