



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12315
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing the physical properties of briquettes from sawdust of <i>Piptadenia africana</i> through combination with <i>Ceiba pentandra</i>
Type of the 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 (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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This is a clearly written paper on the experimental investigation on enhancing the physical properties of briquettes by blending two types of sawdust as the feedstock. This paper has reasonably reviewed related work reported in the literature in the introduction part. The design and conduction of the experiments are technically sound. Results are adequately supported by the data presented. Several comments about places to improve are as follows: (1). It would make this manuscript more insightful if authors would discuss more about the mechanism of how this enhancement occurred. It would also be good to provide explanations and possible hypotheses after every paragraph of statistical analysis. (2). In places where previous researchers' work is referred to, it usually includes last names followed by [number in the reference list]. It would reads better with those names added on in Lines 49, 107, 214 etc. (3). In Line 92, is "ID" short for inner diameter? If so, full name would be better for reader to understand since it is only a one time use. (4). Please provide description of how to mix these two types of particles. (5). In Section 2.2, since materials were blended according to different percentage, why here says "90 g of each biomass material was weighted..."	Thanks, The researcher could not get equipment to examine the ultra structure of the briquettes formed. Hypothesis may not be necessary. The write-up was done in accordance with the house style of the publishers. Suggestion has been effected (Please See page 4 line 93) Correction has been effected (Please See page 4 line 94)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(6). Please edit the manuscript very carefully, several errors and inconsistency in formatting could be found.	Thanks. It has been looked at
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, I rate it as acceptable with minor revision needed.	