



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32187
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Capital and Operating Cost on the Aggregate Production in some selected Quarries in North-Central Nigeria
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 <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 study examines the effect of capital and operating cost on the aggregate production is some selected quarries in North-Central Nigeria using two economic criteria NPV and IRR, therefore: 1. The discussion section should focus more on the capital cost and operating cost vs NPV and IRR; 2. Equations 1-3 which were used to determine NPV, IRR and CPTA should be revised; 3. Selection and significance of a period of three years rather than the economic life of a quarry or project life in determining NPV and IRR should be explained 4. There is a need for a strong conclusion on the impact of capital cost and operating cost on NPV and IRR 5. Since the study did not attempt to analyse the impact of the crushing, drilling and blasting parameters etc, the discussion on their effects on capital cost is baseless; 6. Costs such as fuel cost and if there were government taxes should also be considered in the operating cost in Table 3 7. The total variable cost in Table 3 and total operating cost in Table 4 which look similar, should be revisited 8. Keywords should be revised.	1. Noted 2. the equations are standard equations but can only be explained and expanded. 3. This period was used to enable investors know if they need to increase production or not. They can spread the result over the entire mine age. 4. Noted 5. It is true that the study did not consider impact of crushing, drilling and blasting, but the fact remains that this is one of the most important aspect of the operation and cost consideration cannot be done without recourse to them. 6. Noted 7. Noted 8. Keywords corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The number of existing quarries in North-Central Nigeria should be mentioned in line 50; 2. Since the 8 quarries which are used for construction purpose were not included in the analysis, therefore should be removed from the study; 3. Line 68 spelling for tonne not tonee; 4. All tables and figures should be accompanied with sources of data; 5. It would be very interesting to see the performance of those quarries which are owned by foreign and indigenous firms in the results.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. corrected 4. Tables and results came from questionnaires distributed. 5. noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		