



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11948
Title of the Manuscript:	Resistance to thaumasite form of sulphate attack of blended cement mortars
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	-The abstract write-up lack some important issues. - A concluding statement showing vital results - A brief recommendation on the study -The objective of the study, P4L77-82 needs to be stated in a concise way. It needs to be rephrased - The sudden introduction of B, C, D and E really hurt the reading flow under P5L118-132. The table 3 must be emphasized and explain clearly under that section. It need to be overhauled - Under the methods, a brief description of the method say ASTM (whatever) after stating a reference standards, it is very preferable for clarity without a reader referring to the stated standards. - For brevity at P5L117, it is suggested the subtitle is captured as “Blended cements preparation, mortar formation and curing”. Under such title each is explained in a clear and concise way. The reason being that you may find some set of mortar made under the durability study and some under compressive and flexural. All can be well explained in this section -P6L141-142- That sentence could be taken off. P6L150-P7L151-154- Sentence is not vital. -The section under experimental setup is really jammed up. The section state sulphate durability, pressure resistance and microstructure. It will be better for the methods of each stated parameter be highlighted well -The method used to determine XRD and XRF needs to be explained in the	They were corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Materials and Methods section. -P8L177-178- The reason for that must be supported with a theoretical fact reference from similar literature -P8L181-182- The figure shows both (250 and 500 microns) and not 300 and 400 microns -P10L224-238- The reporting here is very difficult to follow. It would be better to segregate and explain each figure on individual basis but not boxing them together. P11L268- I do not see any work on pressure resistance?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	P1L10-12-Sentence is not too clear. P1L14 The SEM-EDAX was determined on what? P1L23- “whether” be changed to “be it”, “in” to “for” P2L35- air entraining “agents” P2L44, 49- Provide reference after 50% and concrete P3L51-52- Sentence not too clear P3L53- Give an example from literature after C3A P4L92-100- As the heading is stated, one expect that physical properties come first before chemical properties.	All done. New refs were added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		