



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_34937
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal third order rotatable designs constructed from BIBD
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 (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 abstract of the manuscript contains motivation, including a rationale for the need for research in the field. Within the abstract, the authors of the manuscript define the aims of their exploration, the methods leading to their achievement, and they briefly formulate conclusions obtained. I can only recommend that the authors do not use references to the resources used in the abstract. On the contrary, a high-quality search of existing knowledge on the problem solved would be presented in the introductory chapter, where it more or less lacks. Only six sources used are very few. In addition, four of them are from the 1950s to the 1960s, so they do not represent current state of knowledge. The detailed formulation of the study objectives, including a description of the methods and procedures leading to their achievement, would be a part of the introductory chapter, which would also contain the formulation of the research hypotheses that the authors of the manuscript will try to prove. Chapters "Results", "Discussion" and "Conclusion" are absolutely insufficient and they must be expanded.	All the recommendations and concerns from the reviewer noted. Check for the revisions made. More sources added. Between 1950 and 1960 is when much on the construction of the designs was done. That is primarily when design and analysis of experiments were done. Little has been done currently on third order and especially on optimality criteria. Chapters "Results", "Discussion" and "Conclusion" will be expanded. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		