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	**Empirical Research**

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	**1. The abstract did not mention what was achieved with the use of $CaCO_3$** **2. Ref. When the authors are more than two persons use the first author et.al style i.e. in line 29: (Johar et.al, 2012)** **3. Lines 68 – 112: Process conditions such as contact time, temperature, concentration, pH, volume etc are arbitrarily fixed without any reference to previous investigation or authors. How are these values used arrived at.** **4. Lines 242 – 245 should not form part of conclusion** **5.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Recast line 3: Rice straw a locally available ..... was pretreated ..... 2. Recast lines 8-9 3. Probably section 3.3 should have come first before 3.1 4. Findings in section 3.4 were not reflected in the abstract 5. Forth column in Table 2, the unit of tensile strength is not Kg	
Optional/General comments	The language should be improved upon	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer