



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7621
Title of the Manuscript:	Traffic Kinematic Wave Caused By Road Hump: Perceptions and Analysis
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is not always very clear. The way general definitions are reported in the first part should be improved. The definition of the problem that is being studied needs also to be given formally. The contribution of the paper should be better highlighted. Data settings, analysis, and comments on the results should be deepen. Literary review is very limited and should be enlarged taking into accounts relevant papers on the topics. In general, the paper is poorly written and there are several grammatical errors; a careful revision of the paper is needed.	Manuscript has been revised to make it clearer (highlighted in yellow). General definitions in the first part have been improved. Line 50-75 The definition of the problem has formally been given in the revised paper line 53-55 The contribution of the paper has been highlighted in Line 268-282; 293-300 Data collection and analysis have been deepened see line 183 - 202 Literature review has been expanded and relevant papers taken into account. Line 59-75 A careful revision of the paper has been done and all grammatical errors corrected. (highlighted in yellow)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should avoid to cite an equation or a figure that is showed in the following of the manuscript.	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		