



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10831
Title of the Manuscript:	MULTICRITERIA ASSESSMENT OF SHORT LIFE-CYCLE MATERIALS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY
Type of the Article	APPLIED SCIENCE

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	1. Author should avoid 'we' and 'our' words in the MS. 2. P1, L25: 'our thesis', this is not a thesis; authors should revise accordingly. 3. P1, L41: Shen, L & Patel, M; year is missing. 4. P1, L41-42: "Global petrochemical 42 production of chemicals and polymers is around 335 million tonnes." , provide the reference. 5. P1, L46-47: Need to be revised. 6. Referencing is not proper, some places authors provided Author's name and year and some place by number. Authors should follow the author's guidelines and adopt the same. 7. Figure 1 is not displayed completely. 8. The whole MS is presented as thesis, authors need to put all the information in MS format. 9. Some figures are as such copied and authors have not provided the source of that. Authors need to provide source of figure taken from any source and also authors have to get copyright permission from the publisher to use the whole figure as such in the MS.	Thank you for your remarks. You are right. A new version was sent to the Editor in order to be clearer and –we hope, without mistakes. 1 to 9 comments are then accordingly reviewed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		