



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	(1) Overall, much more detail is needed in this short paper. A reader who is not an expert in your field will have an extremely difficult time understanding your paper. (2) In section 3, show the computer code (with clear documentation) and the detailed equations for producing these numbers, as well as the standard errors on these numbers in table 3.1.	(1) For one to understand this paper he/she must have a good understanding of designs and analysis of experiments. (2) There were no computer codes. All the calculations were done manually and matrix manipulations done using matlab software. The matrix calculated the determinant values and eigen values from the information matrix. The value in table 3.1 gives the summary of the optimality criteria vs different number of factors. These values are not machine generated and there are no p-values/standard errors to check their significance. A smaller value means more optimal design.
Minor REVISION comments	(3) Don't use an acronym (i.e., BIBD) in the title. (4) In the abstract, define "E-optimal." (5) In the introduction, clearly explain what are a third order rotatable design and a balanced incomplete block design. (6) Define D-optimality in line 36. In line 51, the subscript on η is μ rather than u. (7) Line 54 begins with a comma.	(3) BIBD will be corrected and written in full in the title. (4) E-optimal is now defined in the abstract. (5) Third order rotatable design and a balanced incomplete block design now explained in the introduction part. (6) D-optimality is defined. Equation in line 51 is in order. η and μ are used differently for they don't mean the same thing. (7) Line 54 corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(8) In line 55, the summations are with respect to u, but there are no subscripts u on the x terms. (9) The word "independent" should be lower-case in line 57. (10) Define all types of optimality (e.g., T-optimal, I-optimal, G-optimal) mentioned in your paper.	(8) Line 55 corrected. (9) Line 57 corrected. (10) All types of optimality defined in the introduction part.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(11) This paper is very difficult to understand, since it lacks sufficient details.	(11) I/we gave only enough details, methods and results Thank for your great comments.