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** *(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	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.	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should avoid to cite an equation or a figure that is showed in the following of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer