

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_95322
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical properties of Soda and Kraft lignin extracted from Gmelina arborea wood
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:

(<https://www.journalirjpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The paper presents a series of interesting results that offer the possibility of widening the directions of industrial use of the extracted lignin. 2. The title of the article reflects the directions of interest presented in the article. 3. The abstract of the article includes the main ideas about the work presented. 4. The structure of the manuscript and its subsections are appropriate. 5. The manuscript presents important aspects for knowledge especially for related fields. 6. For the subject treated, the presented references provide a suitable database for an adequate interpretation and presentation of the results and conclusions of the article.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tita Ovidiu
Department, University & Country	University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania