



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_47714
Title of the Manuscript:	Spruce Wood Flour for Paper Applications – A Handsheet Study
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	The experimental study described application of spruce wood flour as filler at paper production. Practically, it was confirmed that wood flour behaves as similar typical papermaking mineral fillers as clay, calcium carbonates etc. The study has a lot of discrepancies of objective and formally character. Main objective discrepancy – a lack of objective statistical evaluation the received experimental data, i.e. a presentation of confidence interval etc. The lack of more detailed information what type of laboratory handsheet machine and what type of cationic starch was used. It is appreciated a more detailed description of paper handsheets calendering simulation.	All tests were performed in accordance to TAPPI standards, explained in the material section. This is explained in detail in the referenced TAPPI standards
Minor REVISION comments	The text contains a lot of grammatically mistakes and needs a language revision. For more details see the notices in the manuscript.	Revision was made
Optional/General comments	Simply and classically written manuscript but with a lot of discrepancies formally and objective character.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	