



Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_49733
Title of the Manuscript:	Hybrid Precipitated Calcium Carbonate Containing Wood Flour for Paper Applications–A Comparative Handsheet Study
Type of the Article	Original 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	<p>Is t by any blunder or oversight that authors are missing figure error bars for judging statistical differences? This brings the scientific basis of the paper under grilling question.</p> <p>Authors are required to present figures with proper errors or to come forth with compelling explanation for missing errors; failure of which ought to lead to outright rejection of publication.</p> <p>Authors are required to come forth and clear with much more acceptable explanations as pertains to increased and decreased viscosity in highlighted sections.</p> <p>Pre-gallery proof ought to be subject to thorough review by a native speaker for aptness of language.</p> <p>Reviewer should like to see final draft before publication.</p>	<p>All tests were performed according to TAPPI Testing Standards as explained in the Methods Section. Repeatability of the results stayed in between the allowable margins of the TAPPI testing standards.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	