



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16885
Title of the Manuscript:	Review of studies to identify common challenges militating against the attainment of health-related Millennium Development Goals in rural Nigeria;
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	The language expression is unclear. There are too many incomplete sentences and many other sentences with poorly expressed ideas. The author should simple sentences that clearly depict his thoughts. Similarly, many citations are poorly located in sentences, making it difficult to tell which idea is being cited.	I thought given, the comments were similar with that of other reviewers comment, there was no need repeating same. However, I have been able to rephrase the ideas, the sentences were proof read and completed. The citations were placed appropriately in the entire manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		