



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) What are scientific contributions of current paper's content? 2) The description of the test is not clear. 3) How to prove the correctness of the results? 4) Why choose those combined ratio for sample preparation? 5) The details of the experimental results should be further explained.	1. This paper is a preliminary investigation into how the combination of long-fibered material like kenaf bark and short-fibered material like corn husk affects the strength properties of paper. 2. Ok. Thanks. Adjusted 3. Results checked and errors corrected 4. It is just a preliminary study. Further work would be more holistic 5. Ok. Thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Perhaps I misunderstand the sufficient contributions here, but it indicates that the authors have done a poor job illustrating them. 2) How to conduct experiment? The amounts of specimens, the method of measurement, and how to obtain a specimen, are not clearly stated. 3) How to prove the correctness of the results? 4) Why choose those combined ratio for sample preparation? The details of the experimental results should be further explained.	1. Adjustment, clarification and more explanation have been provided. 2. This is just a preliminary study
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The structure of this paper is somewhat confusion.	Adjustment has been made