



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_7347
Title of the Manuscript:	Modification of Rice Straw Pulp by Calcium Carbonate/ Microcrystalline Cellulose
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	The instruments and the chemical reagents used should be stated with their brand names, company from which it was produced, the city and country of origin. Authors should produce the detail working parameters such as the voltage, current, scanning rate etc. of the XRD and TEM used in the study The results and discussion section should clearly state and explain the results obtained under each analysis and then thoroughly discussed Analytical data in tables should be presented in a consistent decimal place. References stated in the text do not follow a uniform style, where there are more than two authors; et al should be used and this must be consistent all through the text. Authors should refer to journal referencing style to ensure uniformity. The reference line 255,256 is out of place, and also reference line 268 and 269 can be put together.	I stated the chemicals I wrote the parameters that I could get from the technician I try References were corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	TEM images not clear and poorly presented The X and Y axis of the XRD profile not well labelled	Due to Quality of instrument
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The introduction part has done a good literature survey and that must be applied to the results and discussion part to be able to show a good argument for the results obtained.	Thank you