



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJAST_4430
Title of the Manuscript:	High performance thermal properties of natural pumice-based bricks
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript must be edited in detail again. There are many grammatical mistakes as well as typing errors, missing spaces, etc. I would recommend the authors to have their paper read by a native English speaker. The language of the paper is very poor and the paper needs to be re-written. It is difficult to comprehend the significant issues because of the language.	Thanks for your comment and the advice. The grammatical and typing mistakes were corrected and the paper has improved significantly.
	At the introduction section of the paper there are quite important knowledge on the subject was given from different references without the considerations of the authors and the knowledge couldn't be associated with the main objective. Therefore the hypothesis couldn't be underlined sufficiently.	The structure of the article was rewritten and information was guided to show the correlation between themes developed and the final hypothesis.
	The hypothesis, goals and objectives of the study should be given at the introduction in a more comprehensive way by referring the previous studies on this subject.	The objectives were including into the text, searching a continued idea of the arguments given with the objective mentioned. The hypothesis is shown at the end of "introduction" section.
	The methodology is not very clear and must be explained holistically before going on with the details explained at the subtitles. The study is definitely significant but the way of considering the issues and presenting is not sufficient for a peer reviewed scientific journal. Ten different samples prepared for the experimental study did not clearly explained in the paper so that it is not easy to make analysis.	We re-write the methodology section considering the reviewer comment. We have to strive to do it as good as possible.
	The conclusion of the study must be written again by	Analysing the result in more detail, conclusion



SDI Review Form 1.6

	considering from all points of view explained in the results.	were rewritten by considering the main objective and the established hypothesis. The new final conclusion enhances the relevant knowledge generated in this research.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		