



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJAST_4430
Title of the Manuscript:	High performance thermal properties of natural pumice-based bricks

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The paper, which is about the thermal properties characterization of the pumice based lightened bricks by using experimental methods in accordance with ASTM standards, has been revised by taking account of the previous comments. However there are still some issues that have to be paid attention. For example; there are still some grammar mistakes such as; Lines 63-66, "The benefits of use natural material become evident when considering that for every MW/h of renewable energy generated, the emission of approximately 0.75 T of CO₂ is avoided [25] and a "model" tree can absorb 0.67 T of CO₂ [26]." The sentence must be corrected as "The benefits of natural material use become evident ... Line 71: Natural materials shows should be corrected as natural materials show... Line 137-138 – The grammar should be improved... Lines 215-216 – Should be revised ... The paper should be proofread and the writing inaccuracies as well as the grammar mistakes should be amended. Lines 95-98 - In the description of the methodology, it is not clear how NMX and ASTM standards were applied. The methodology needs to be explained comprehensively. Lines 267-27 - Table 4 was not referred in the text. The references should be double-checked and the numbers should be in sequence in the manuscript. It would be good if the authors could finish the conclusion with a statement that represents the overall significance of this research and how it connects to the big picture.	We gratefully acknowledge the reviewer suggestions to improve the manuscript We review all the manuscript and a deeper English edition was done We corrected the paragraph in lines 63-66 as the reviewer suggest We corrected the paragraph in line 71 as the reviewer suggest We improved the grammar in lines 137-138 as the reviewer suggest We revised and corrected the content of lines 215-216 Grammar has been improved as reviewer suggest We avoid the use of NMX and consider exclusively ASTM standards and improve the methodology explanation as reviewer suggest Table 4 is referred in line 257 We correct the references as reviewer suggest and they are shown in numerical sequence We have corrected the conclusions considering the reviewer suggestion