



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12532
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ALUMINOSILICATE REFRACTORY BRICK USING UNWANA BEACH SILICA SAND, EKEBEDI AND UNWANA CLAYS
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The abstract needs improvement, it is hard to follow, the message being attempt to deliver is not clear. 2. The author/authors use °C without any reference to temperature, it should be identified. 3. On page 3 the author describes the determination of chemical composition by citing a model used "210 VGP" without referencing the source. 4. A photo of the samples as well as the test rig etc...is needed, this will help educate the reader about the subject matter and allow transparency in seeing the real process. 5. On page 5, more description about the compressive strength testing and how the measurements were obtained should be added. 6. Adding a table showing the data measured of compressive strength for each sample is needed. 7. The equation in page 5 should be numbered and referenced as no reference to "Shuen's formula is cited. 8. It should be mentioned in the text that the units for Refractoriness is a temperature in degree °C. 9. Table 3 to 5, having 3 tables is redundant;	1. The abstract is straight forward and clear. 2. It is generally accepted to use °C when you are referring to temperature in degree centigrade. 3. The source has been cited. 4. The photo of a sample has been added. 5. The description of the compressive strength testing has been improved. 6. Adding table will lead to duplication of result. 7. The source of the "Shuen's formula" was cited. 8. It is generally accepted to use °C when you are referring to the units of refractoriness in degree centigrade 9. The adjustment has been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	they should be combined into one table with various columns. 10. The same should apply to Figures 1 through 4 since the y and x abscissas are the same “percentage”. 11. A sample photo showing measurements before and after drying of the specimen to illustrate the shrinkage and other issues is very beneficial; it will add value to the work performed. 12. The discussion is poorly written, as is it is very hard to get a clear message of what is being implied and real confusing. Tables need to be created to list the samples along with data being discussed in this section. 13. The data presented in the figures are poorly explained. More details and clear representation is needed. 14. More explanation as to why the results behaved as reported is essential. Only listing the outcome without any reference to the reason that caused it is incomplete. 15. On page 11, the paragraph starting with line 195 is not clear, as is; it is only a group of independent statements without merit or relevance to the findings. 16. Page 12 is equally poor, it has to be rewritten, having so many numbers is very confusing, adding tables and referring to them will improve the delivery of the intended communication. 17. The author on line 199 states that the bulk density increased with increase in Unwana Beach sans content without stating the reason for such observation.	10. The scales used for the axis x and y for figures 1 to 4 now figures 3 to 6 should not be the same since the data being used are not the same. 11. A sketch for shrinkage test has been added. 12. Correction has been made on. Using table together with graph in a paper will lead to duplication of result. 13. The discussion has been improved. 14. The reasons that caused the behaviours has been stated. 15. it is clear and relevant. 16. Those numbers indicating temperature and others are necessary, addition of table will lead to duplication of result. 17. The reason for the behaviour has been stated.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	18. The conclusion can be much improved. It is not well written and it does not offer a clear and conclusive message. The paper is in need for major revisions. It lacks delivery of a clear representation as to have been done and found. I believe a good editorial work up is required to improve its quality.	18. The conclusion has been improved.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		