



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRRI_5813
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF DOUBLE MOULD VIBRATION - COMPACTOR BLOCK MOULDING MACHINE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 Line 174 Line 176 Lines 167-265	<p>-The re is no justification for the objective as been emphasised by the Author(s) in this work at all, so as to arrive at the production of 800 blocks per 8 hours</p> <p>- No where in this work is any indication of development, assemblage or manufacture of the vibration-compaction block moulding machine.</p> <p>- These are various photographs of the block moulding machine shown in the work. Any of such photographs/pictures could come from anywhere. Therefore, there must be some technical drawings showing assembled parts or part-by-part and giving their appropriate details and labelling. This should be done to justify the aspect of its development that makes it different from the conventional (sandcrete)block moulding machine</p>	I agree with the Reviewer and have done the necessary corrections as listed
Minor REVISION comments Lines: 2, 3 Line 5 lines 7 to 9 Line 34 Line 37	<p>- "9in", "6in" to be removed (or state its equivalent in SI units)</p> <p>- N/mm² should be N/mm².</p> <p>- Incomplete statements. (These and other serious syntax errors are found in the whole write-up, almost in all paragraphs)</p> <p>- The word "Vibrated" should be removed</p> <p>- The word "input" should be replace with "ingredient" as that is the appropriate technical</p>	I agree with the Reviewer and have done the necessary corrections as listed



SDI Review Form 1.6

Lines 42 to 45 Line 55 Lines 124, 129, 142, 145 Line 152	word. - Seriously incomplete and incoherent statements - Words “using” is in tautology - Most equations symbols are not clearly defined especially at their first appearance, e.g.: $P = F/A$, What’s F, A??? - Equations are not at all numbered accordingly - $P = P \times 60/2 \cdot N$, Note “P” appears twice and “N” notdefined	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Not Available	