



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_46881
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MICROCRYSTALLINE CELLULOSE ISOLATED FROM THE POD HUSK AND STALK OF FLUTED PUMPKIN
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Overall, the manuscript is well structured. This study will be valuable for the readers interested in MCC or cellulose in general. A few modifications should be made before this paper to be considered for publication. I would recommend this manuscript after these minor comments:</p> <p>1) line 17: "Composition" is too broad for a key word, should consider cellulose or others as keyword</p> <p>2) There must be a space between the figure and the unit measure except for %</p> <p>a) line 5: 2.5 N instead of 2.5N</p> <p>b) line 60: 10mins</p> <p>c) line 69: 5g, 50mL, 24hrs</p> <p>d) line 70: 105°C, 6h</p> <p>e) line 71: 0.5g, 100mL</p> <p>f) line 72: 1h</p> <p>g) line 75: 105°C, 6h</p> <p>h) line 80: 1hr</p> <p>i) line 81: 105°C, 6h</p> <p>j) line 88: 25ml</p> <p>k) line 92: 5min</p> <p>l) line 93: 30mins</p> <p>m) line 95: 105°C, 6h</p> <p>n) line 100: 550°, 4hrs</p> <p>o) line 104: 1.2kg</p> <p>p) line 105: 18L</p> <p>q) line 107: 80°C, 4L</p> <p>r) line 109: 80°C, 1hr</p> <p>s) line 110: 4L, 50°C</p> <p>t) line 112: 65±1.5°C</p> <p>u) line 115: 1000g and 5L</p> <p>v) line 117: 80°C, 3.5L</p> <p>w) line 118: 80°C, 3.750L</p> <p>x) line 119: 80°C, 1hr</p> <p>y) line 120: 1.4L</p> <p>z) line 121: 80°C</p> <p>aa) line 122: 2.5L, 80°C, 1hr</p> <p>ab) line 124: 65±1.5°C</p> <p>ac) line 127: 161g, 2.5N</p> <p>ad) line 130: 65±1.5°C</p> <p>ae) line 135: 135: 50mL</p> <p>af) line 137: 2g</p> <p>ag) line 138: 3h, 105°C</p> <p>ah) line 151: 26ml</p> <p>ai) line 167: 15ml, 10ml</p> <p>aj) line 168: 10ml, 2mins</p> <p>ak) line 169: 10min, 10min</p> <p>al) line 187-188: 250µm-63µm (is this µm instead?)</p> <p>am) line 194: , 25°C</p> <p>an) line 228: 14 %</p>	<p>The corrections as indicated by the reviewer are well-effected.</p> <p>4) Isolation of alpha cellulose</p> <p>Pod husk: 1.2 kg of dried pod husk was de-lignified using 18 L of sodium hydroxide</p> <p>Stalk: 1000 g of dried pod husk was de-lignified using 5 L of sodium hydroxide</p> <p>Is there any reason why the amount of NaOH used is too different?</p> <p>The reason why the different volumes of NaOH were used is as a result of the differences in the quantity of fibre content each of the substrates have (stalk and pod husk).</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>ao) line 283: 63–250µm (is this µm instead?) ap) line 284: 250µm aq) line 285: 180µm (is this µm instead?) ar) line 286: 125µm (is this µm instead?) as) line 287: 180µm (is this µm instead?) at) line 293: 70-1000µm (is this µm instead?)</p> <p># Some of the degree temp doesn't use the degree sign. Use correctly the degree symbol instead of the superscript zero. # The use of "hour" short form "h, hr and hrs". Please use a standardize version throughout the paper # The use of "minute" short form "min, mins". Be consistent</p> <p>3) line 133: BP should be declared for first time use</p> <p>4) Isolation of alpha cellulose Pod husk: 1.2 kg of dried pod husk was de-lignified using 18 L of sodium hydroxide Stalk: 1000 g of dried pod husk was de-lignified using 5 L of sodium hydroxide Is there any reason why the amount of NaOH used is too different?</p> <p>5) Line 125: filtered through the muslin cloth to obtain a small mass oven dried... Something is missing there.</p> <p>6) Table 2: a) true density, tapped density, Hausner's ratio, mixture content, porosity: standardize the decimal point b) angle of repose: missing degree sign at C-MCC</p> <p>7) Line 277: what is the range of standard limits for the degree of polymerization?</p> <p>8) SEM images Put label on the pics for the rod like, irregular and flat shaped</p> <p>9) The reference style is not uniform</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>