



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6934
Title of the Manuscript:	Consequences of Violating Randomization In Cluster Sampling
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 <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	No revision required	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No revision required	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The result is very interesting and has a scope of further study. I have no criticism about the originality. Within my literature knowledge the work results seem to be original. I am of opinion the readers of the journal would find it interesting and useful. The manuscript is free from typographical and mathematical errors. Therefore, the manuscript is accepted for the publication in the refereed journal.	