



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14885
Title of the Manuscript:	AN APPROACH OF EXERGY ANALYSIS OF HUMAN PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSE IN THE OUTDOOR CONDITIONS DURING BLOCKLAYING IN OGUN STATE, NIGERIA
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	The aim of current study is not clearly formulated, though it is understandable. Nevertheless the aim must be formulated as well as specific tasks of the study. Place and duration, methods and instruments, results are formulated excellently.	1. The aim and specific task of the study has been included, thanks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I have strong feeling that reference list is not fulfilled according to instructions for authors. E.g., in the most references, year of edition is concluding the reference, not following the title of journal (refs. 1-9, 11-17, 19-22,24,25), the presence of abbr. "Vol."/"vol." is also not desirable (1, 2, 3, 40, as well as "Pp." (1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 23).	1. Reference corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Rather interesting study allowing to approach human exergy stores from purely physiological point of view. Ethical issues-: Judging by the text of article – no...	1. All the ethical issues was discussed in line with the literatures. 2. I appreciate the comments of the reviewer.