



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10745
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of pulp blending on the strength properties of paper from kenaf bark and corn husk
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The chemical characterisation (Kappa number, cellulose content etc.) of resulted pulp are not given in the results. 2. Results of bleaching are not presented in the paper. Chemical and optical characteristics. 3. It is better to give the results of strength properties as index, in order to easy comparison. 4. The obtained results must be compared with results from other studies in discussion section. 5. Line 88 – there are reference to paper density in Seth 1990 publication, but in the manuscript the paper density value is not given? 6. The all data from graphics is repetition of data from Table 2.	1. The residual lignin (kappa number) and cellulose content of the pulp are very important factors that impart on the strength of paper. However, this study is just a preliminary investigation. Further study would be more incisive and more comprehensive. 2. The optical properties of the pulp samples, albeit important, but not crucial to the scope of the work, which is majorly on the strength properties of resulting paper samples. 3. Results in index? Please I don't understand that. 4. Little or no work has been done in this particular area i.e combination of pulp from kenaf and pulp from corn husk 5. That is inappropriate. It has been removed. 6. Ok. Thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Available amount of corn husk as a raw material is important issue. Modern corn harvesting machinery do not separate the husk from whole stalk and leaves. Furthermore, the silica content of corn husk is another important topic.	1. Annual production of corn in Nigeria is massive, in the region of 11 million tonnes annually. The husks are removed manually by local corn processing traders. During its season, corn husk with no beneficial use, litters every city and form major components of our dumpsites. Much hasn't been done to investigate the silica content of corn husk, however other chemical



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. During conventional pulping process the pulp are not dried between pulping and bleaching stages, this will cause hornification that decrease the paper strength properties. The drying of pulp must be explained. 3. Pulping yield is important parameter that is recommended to be given in the results. 4. The handsheed procedure is not given in the material section. 5. Standard testing methods for strength properties are not given in the material section. 6. The data about beating of pulp are not presented in the paper. The drainage property (SR° of CSF) of pulp is one of important properties of pulp. 7. Cooking duration is not given. (H-factor will be useful parameter.) 8. Basis weight of paper sheets is not given. 9. Graphics- Bar graphics will better present the situation. Arranging the blend series from 100% to 0% in the graphics (KC1, KC5, KC3, KC4 and KC 2) will present the situation better. Additionally, the results can be arranged as XY graphic, which will illustrate the effect of blending ratio on strength property. 10. According to the TAPPI test methods the units of tensile stiffness is (kN/m), in the manuscript is in "m". The difference can be explained.	compositions have been investigated and published. 2. Drying was actually done at room temperature. Just by spreading in the laboratory while waiting bleaching. 3. Previous studies have investigated the pulp yield from soda pulping process. 4. Its been included 5. Noted 6. In the absence of a beater, pulp samples weren't beaten but defibrized using a laboratory disintegrator. Freeness wasn't considered too. 7. Stated 8. That wasn't put into consideration. Subsequent work would cover that. 9. Graphs have been removed. Tables only would be appropriate 10. It has been corrected.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Graphs – Placing the units in the Y axis is better. 2. Title on the top of the graphics is not necessary. Information on the caption is enough. 3. The square of units must be given as super script or simple inserted from symbols. The ASCII code of square “2” is “Alt”+253. Press “Alt” and type 253. 4. Tensile strength must be presented as kN/m.	1, 2. Graphs have been removed. Tables only. 3. Corrected 4. Corrected
--	---	---