



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> 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>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> 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/mm<sup>2</sup>.</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>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p>Lines 42 to 45 Line 55</p> <p>Lines 124, 129, 142, 145</p> <p>Line 152</p>	<p><b>word.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Seriously incomplete and incoherent statements</b></li> <li>- <b>Words “using” is in tautology</b></li> <li>- <b>Most equations symbols are not clearly defined especially at their first appearance, e.g.: <math>P = F/A</math>, What’s F, A???</b></li> <li>- <b>Equations are not at all numbered accordingly</b></li> <li>- <b><math>P = P \times 60/2 \cdot N</math>, Note “P” appears twice and “N” notdefined</b></li> </ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Not Available	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**