



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17821
Title of the Manuscript:	A blue Mind: A Brain Computer Interface study on the cognitive effects of text colors
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1) ABSTRACT: The number of students who served as subjects should be mentioned here and not only at the main body of the paper. (2) INTRODUCTION: Line 104: the previous study being referred to here should be cited. The statement 'not published data' is not enough because this is a scientific paper and not story telling. (3) METHOD: Line 128: reframe wireless way so to improve..... ; To read: ...wireless way so as to improve..... (4) There is no subheading for DISCUSSION. This should not be masked with conclusion. (not acceptable in research) The limitations of this study should be clearly stated.	Thank you very much for the attention given to our study and for your precious feedback. (1) Abstract: we added the number of students involved in the experiment (2) Introduction: we added the reference to our previous study. Thank you for your indication: we missed to insert it. (3) We corrected the sentence. (4) We introduced a subheading for DISCUSSION and treated separately the two paragraphs. (5) We indicated the limitation of the study at the end of the paragraph CONCLUSIONS All the corrections have been highlighted in yellow colour.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is good with adequate scientific rigor but the author should address the issues raised above.	Thank you for precious comments and suggestions.