



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6447
Title of the Manuscript:	COW DUNG ASH (CDA) AS PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF CEMENTING MATERIAL IN THE PRODUCTION OF CONCRETE
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 7: "The experiment were design for mix ratio of 1:2:4 to study" this ratio is not used, It is not mentioned in any other part of the text. Remove. Line 107: TABLE 1. Column Weight of Cube is it in fact necessary? Line 107: TABLE 1. 5, 577.80 kg/m3 is very high (is it correct?)	Line 7 have been revised and corrected accordingly. Line 107: TABLE 1-4. Weights of Cube column have been removed. TABLE 2: 5, 577.80 kg/m3 is a typographical error which has been corrected.
Optional/General comments		

Comment [R1]: Without meaning. It is not mentioned in any other part of the text. Remove.