



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30421
Title of the Manuscript:	Geological study, physical and mechanical characterization of the Bidzar quarry white marble (North-Cameroon) incoming in the CPJ 35 and CPJ 45 cement manufacturing
Type of the Article	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 (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	The manuscript tackles information on marbles that can be used for cement manufacturing. There is little international information on these materials, both regarding geology and their use as raw materials. The content of the paper will serve to widen knowledge of an area that has not been exposed enough in international literature. However, the paper contains many drawbacks to be admitted as it is. First of all, the manuscript should follow a complete English edition. Also, many uncommon punctuation symbols and words are used in the text (e.g. î, petardage, litage, vintage). They should be removed and changed to English equivalents before going ahead with any further revision. Regarding methodology: A revision of the description of analytical method should be done (e.g. a mixture of 7.200g lithium tetraborate (Li₂ B₂ O₄) and 0.800g of powder??) Authors use a French normative. An explanation should be done, as a norme of wider application (e.g. European normative, ASTM) is more useful when thinking of a wider use of the product. If the French norm is more convenient, a wider explanation should be done for the publication in an international journal The paper mentions petrographic parameters (e.g. outcrop, granulometrie, color, structure, and numbers) but these are not most common petrographic parameters, as they refer mainly to macroscopic analysis. Some comments on descriptive issues: Grain size: average? Do you mean "médium"?	Revision was carried out to clearly describe the methodology. Most of the tests carried out and referred to followed the French standards and have their equivalence in either BS ASTM which are common tests and do not require verbose explanations.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusions: The white marble of the study area is very rich in CaO; Compared to what? At least add some material that has been used or study with the same purpose. The authors state as conclusion: The white marble is richer in CaO (52.65% - 55.45%) than the dolomitic one (30.15% - 31.78%) and less rich in MgO (0.65% - 1.45%) than the dolomitic marble (15.76% - 19.69%). This is not a conclusion: All calcitic marbles have higher Ca than dolomitic marbles Regarding figures: Legend in Figure 2 states: Note: The Study area is materialised by the black square at the Bidzar level  Study area that is very difficult, if not impossible, to see. Figure 6 is meaningless. Evolution of CaO from what to what? The observation about how calcitic marble has more calcium than dolomitic marble is redundant. The same about Mg. Figure 7 does not add anything new to the paper.	Dolomitic marble In cement manufacture it is evident that for economic purposes, the manufacturer will prefer deposits richer in CaO than MgO Corrected see the map with a red arrow indicating the zone
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		