



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	BritishJournalofAppliedScience&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

GeneralguidelineforPeerReviewprocess:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lackofNovelty', 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	No compulsory revision	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 71: replace <u>shown below</u> by <u>shown in Table 1</u>. Line 76: (the country can be specified) Ebony State, <u>Nigeria</u>. Line 84: The model is: <u>Buck Scientific model 210 VGP Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer</u>. Line 89: Ekebedi and Unwana clays were recorded on the <u>Table 2</u>, containing the total batch weighing and <u>the</u> mixing percentages.	- The replacement has been made. - The country has been indicated. - Yes. - The correction has been made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is clear about the subject, describing all the procedures necessary to identify the material properties. However (I apologize to say that), it is composed of a series of standard procedures, seeming more a technical report than a research paper.	