



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper has some potential. Having said that, the structure of the paper needs some work. The author should have an introduction with a problem statement. What has been provided is more like the societal benefits of the sandcrete block. Their primary subject is the machine so more information on the existing machine is required. They should also include a review of related work in the production of similar machines and identify their value proportion that is explain the novelty of their approach. They are also encouraged to make a distinction between their methodology and findings. How did their review the efficiency and effectiveness of their machine? In their discussion they should include any recommendations for further work etc?	I agree with the Reviewer and have done the necessary corrections as listed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		