

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_76932
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical Characteristics of Organophilic Clay Developed using hexadecyltrimethylammoniumchloride (HDTMAC) Modifier
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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>The manuscript Ms_IRJPAC_76932 entitled “Physicochemical Characteristics of Organophilic Clay Developed using hexadecyltrimethylammoniumchloride (HDTMAC) Modifier”</p> <p>Title: Concise and informative. Preferred to define the chemical name clearly by subdividing the name as follows: “Physicochemical Characteristics of Organophilic Clay Developed using Hexadecyl-trimethyl Ammonium Chloride (HDTMAC) Modifier”</p> <p>Abstract: Clear and informative. Few modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>Introduction: Too long, the introduction requires rephrasing for more clarity and understanding, as well as rearrangement into 3 paragraphs only i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to the authors.</p> <p>The aim: Clear and informative.</p> <p>Materials and methods: Clear and informative with some suggested modifications for increasing the readability and understanding. The authors have to list the models of the listed devices used in the study.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: Results are clear, novel, and informative with some suggested modifications. The discussion was to some extent sufficient, clear, informative, and contribute to knowledge. The discussion section required more speculation and comparison with the other works.</p> <p>Conclusion: Clear and informative with few modifications suggested.</p> <p>Tables and Figures: Properly displayed and organized.</p> <p>References: MUST BE UPDATED as 27% (10 out of 37) of the listed references were published in the past five years. This percent has to be raised to 35-40% at least.</p> <p>Decision: Accepted with minor revision.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Revision amended</p> <p>Correction amended</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>General view: The manuscript was written in moderate English and grammar. Revision and copy editing is recommended.</p>	<p>Done grammar correction</p>

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)	