



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13651
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Modeling of Head Loss through Duct Fittings in Conditioned Air Distribution Systems
Type of the Article	Original Research 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In line 88 you provided the equation with x, and by a consequence as a reader/reviewer it wasn't clear to me the role of x (one, undefined). I propose to add before (in line 87), something like this "...of y and x, where $x = x_1$ or x_2 ".	The relevant lines have been corrected as per reviewer's comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Is it possible to simulate such system to see which factors are most important?	The analysis of case studies to determine the more important factors would make the paper unduly lengthy; and so, is not done