



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 (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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work is related to high yield pulping of rice straw, and improvement of paper properties by adding MCC/CaCO₃. The work is not a new. Title of the paper is wrong. - Author is failed to support his work in the introduction. Unnecessarily started introduction with H₂O₂ pulp bleaching mechanism. There is no literature review on rice straw pulping at low temperature and alkali or high yield pulping. Author was supposed to mention of reason of MCC filler with proper citation. Rice straw pulp inheritably contains high amount of fines, which caused higher surface properties. - Total volume of work is not sufficient. Only one condition was used for pulping, which was bleached in 1, 2 and 4% H₂O₂.	I correct the title literature review on pretreatment rice straw before pulping at low temperature and high yield pulp were added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Results and discussion is unacceptable. In the discussion, author should stated pulping results first. But suddenly started with X-ray of MCC. In Table 2, air permeability of 2.5% and 5% MCC / CaCO₃ filled paper was lower than the unbleached pulp. How? - And many more	I corrected these mistakes
--	---	----------------------------