



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_36885
Title of the Manuscript:	Treatments of Recycled Pulps from Old Corrugated Containers. Part I. The Effects of Boron Compounds on Optical and Physical Properties
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The cited references are too little the authors need to add more references The nearest cited reference is in 2007 that is too much old, the authors need to cite more modern and updated published works. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction the authors mention about 'Papyrus plants, which naturally grew up in 28 Egypt about 3000 years ago' although I doubt about the date as I think it is much earlier, the authors need to cite a reference about this information. Line 99: 'The laboratory type standard British Sheet Former was used to prepare test papers from those pulps' it is better to mention the standard code. Line 153: 'As a general conclusion, when examining to Table 3' it is not a suitable place to derive a conclusion. This paper is lacking the point of discussion, I suggest to add more discussion points and arguments in the section 'results and discussion' not only writing the results obtained so the reader can find more convincing points for the experimental works achieved. As a reviewer I cant review only results, the number of cited references in this section is only 4 published works that's not accepted. The authors need to do more discussion so it can be reviewed. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested to reform the tables lines to be in the publishing form. There are some grammar mistakes and mistyping are needed to be revised like 'stuy' missed letter in line 163. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Ahmed Sayed Ahmed Afifi
Department, University & Country	Material Science and Engineering, Egypt