



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34690
Title of the Manuscript:	GLUED LAMINATED TIMBER PRODUCED WITH TROPICAL BRAZILIAN WOOD SPECIES
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		
Minor REVISION comments	• Replace humidity with moisture content (i.e., at 12% humidity) • Are authors really sure that the adhesive consumption was 350 g/cm³? If so, weight of a cubic meter of the GLT would be 350.000 kg plus wood weight which is impossible. • Scientific names should be written in italics. • "For this comparison, the MINITAB statistical program was used, through means analysis of variance. For the verification of the hypotheses, the MINITAB program, ANOVA - Dunnett's subroutine, was used, with a significance level of 0.05. that is, the possibility of considering the hypothesis H0 as being true and this being false is 5%" move to method section. • Standard deviations should be added in Tables.	
Optional/General comments	The authors described the contribution for a better utilization of the alternative tropical wood species, especially in the employment to the production of structural elements of glued laminated timber. The study is interesting as such and may be worth publishing after some revision and amendment. • Authors gave good background information in the Introduction section. • The problem statement of the study should be stated more clearly. • They should emphasize the importance of their	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	study. • They should also make the differences between their study and other studies already published. • It would be better if authors summarized the primarily tests rather than giving too much details which made the paper difficult to follow.	
--	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Engin Derya Gezer</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Forest Industry Engineering Department, Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey</i>