



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_7688
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISONS BETWEEN PVOH AND SDS AS SURFACTANTS IN NR/PVAc LATEX BLENDS
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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Please give the full name of the abbreviation in the manuscript title, such as NR and PVOH. 2. Please add the units to the ordinate of Fig. 1-5. 3. If possible, please improve the quality of all Figures above. It appears to be not very clear. 4. Line 231, "which is concentration dependent in respect of the surfactant solution." can be revised as "which shows a strong dependence on the surfactant concentration."? 5. Line 239, the citation should not appear in the conclusion. 6. Some literature is too old. Please cite related literature recently published. For example, (1) Yang, Z.Y., Tang Y.J., Zhang J.H. (2013). Surface modification of CaCO_3 nanoparticles with silane coupling agents for improvement of the interfacial compatibility with styrene-butadiene rubber (SBR) latex, Chalcogenide Letters 4:131-141. http://www.chalcogen.infim.ro/131_Yang.pdf (2) Tang Y.J., Zhou D.D., Zhang J.H. (2013). Novel polyvinyl alcohol/styrene butadiene rubber latex/carboxymethyl cellulose nanocomposites reinforced with modified halloysite nanotubes, Journal of Nanomaterials, 2013: 1-8, Article ID 542421. http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jnm/2013/542421/	1. Corrected. 2. The parameter in the ordinate has no unit because it is ration of two like quantities. 3. Unfortunately, the quality of the Figures cannot be improved beyond the present. Apology for this. 4. Line 231 has been accordingly corrected. 5. Line 239 has been modified, and the citation removed in the conclusion. 6. The inclusion of the "too old" was purely based on its relevance to the issues concerned in the paper. I consider that it does not make much significance to cite recent but not too relevant literature to the study. The author, nevertheless appreciate the examples cited which will be helpful to guide in similar subsequent study.
Optional/General comments		