



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_20389
Title of the Manuscript:	Geotechnical evaluation of Malikhore Formation as coarse aggregate and dimension stone, SE Balochistan, Pakistan
Type of the Article	Research

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 paper has many grammar and language mistakes. First of all, these should be fixed and have the manuscript read by a qualified colleague or a native speaker. • Then, there are some technical weakness in the paper secondly these should be strengthened. • There are some sentences and words that are not clear or used incorrectly. These are needed to be fixed. For example in line 61, it is stated that sedimentary rocks include formations, this should be vice versa. • Use of geotechnical term is not quite right in the title and paper. Investigation should be used in the title instead geotechnical evaluation and in the paper geotechnical properties should be separated into physical, mechanical, chemical and petrographic properties. • Formations include more than one lithology thus specific lithology should be defined for aggregate investigation instead using formation such as investigation of carbonate rocks of Malikhore Formation.... instead Geotechnical evaluation of Malikhore Formation.....	The paper is revised and typographical and other mistakes are removed. The technical weakness of the paper is reduced by incorporating all suggestion, made by referees. Title, figures, tables and text is modified. The vague sentence is reframed (line 61-62. Title is revised in the light of referee comments. Advice of referee accepted and heading 4.1 Geotechnical Properties is deleted from revised manuscript. Advice of referee is adopted and title is revised for carbonate rocks.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• How many tests were run should be indicated for LA abrasion and average value should be given • How were flakiness and elongation indexes were defined? • Dimension stone section is quite short in comparison to the aggregate sections, so this section should be extended.	Three separate tests were carried out to assess average LA values of the studied rock samples. It is also mentioned in the revised manuscript. Definition of flakiness and elongation index is included in the text and elaborated in Fig 2. A number of measured engineering properties are same as the aggregate, so only additional characteristics of dimension stone is described.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• In Figure 2, which graph is for SSD and which graph is for water absorption should be indicated • General geology should be named Geological Setting • A geologic map should be added to the Geological Setting	Previous Figure 2 is corrected. Suggestion of referee is incorporated. Geologic map of the study area is included as new Fig. 1.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Figure 1 is small. It could be extended a little bit and a north arrow should be inserted.	Previous Fig. 1 is inserted as Fig. 1a in the revised manuscript.