



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10546
Title of the Manuscript:	TRIZ: a catalyst method for an innovative Eco design
Type of the 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. It is necessary to proofread the manuscript, especially for the abstract. 2. The format of references should comply with the requirement of this Journal. 3. The author(s) should spend more efforts on the accuracy of reference. For example, Reference 9 – “Development of green product innovation design method” should be replaced with Development of product green innovation design method”. 4. The author mistook the first name and last name of Chinese authors in references and cited referenced in manuscript. This lead to many mistakes and should be corrected. For example, in Reference 8 (in Line 336), “Chih-Chen, L., JahauLewis,C.” should be corrected as ““Liu, Chih-Chen and Chen, Jahau Lewis” or ““Liu, C. C. and Chen, J. L.” 5. There is No description or explanation (in text) for Table 6. 6. Please explain why the total score varies between 0 and 100 (in Line 156) not “between 0 and 125”. (25 cells and each cell was rating 0 to 5) 7. Please explain why the author selected the five elements – material used, energy use, release, comfort factors and adaptation as the environmental concerns in Table 1.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. It is better to explain the relation between eco-innovation parameters and engineering parameters in Fig.2.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. The text in Fig.1 is too small to read. 3. Text in Fig.4 is too vague to read.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer