



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology and the results obtained from the study matched sufficiently with the objectives of the study. How did you condition your papers after production? Does the conditioning process have any effect on the brightness of the papers? Would you like to study the colour stability of the papers over a certain period of time? Effect of light and humidity? Perhaps, degradation of the wood flour in paper could impact the quality of the paper. Could you please give a line of opinion on the physical feel of the hand sheets if they differ from one another? 	<p>Conditioning was done by TAPPI test method T 402 sp-08, "Standard conditioning and testing atmospheres for paper, board, pulp handsheets, and related products" as mentioned in Section 2.1. Paper properties were not affected.</p> <p>This is a good suggestion. I have added it to Section 3.6 Suggestions.</p> <p>The produced paper did not have any different physical feel then the produced paper containing the commercial filler products.=> Added to Conclusion Section.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 389: "Wood flour" not "Wood flower" 	Corrected.
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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>NONE</p>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	NONE	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	NONE	