



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_39093
Title of the Manuscript:	Arching of Railway Turnouts by Analytical Design Method
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>)

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 is not completed: the abstract tells the reader: WHAT you did, WHY you did it, HOW you did it, WHAT you found, and WHAT it means. I would recommend completing the keywords (minimum five). In this paper the equations are small (unreadable). I recommend rewriting of the equations using Equation or Latex, unitary numbering of all formulas and also the numbers of the equations must be aligned to the right. The conclusions are short, and the practical application of the solution is not clear. The authors must complete the pages and the volume number, ISSN o ISBN of the quoted papers/proceedings.	Abstract was completed at the beginning and end. One keyword added. Equations were created in the Microsoft Equation 3.0 editor. Neither the Editor nor the second Reviewer raised any objections regarding their legibility. A uniform numbering of all formulas has been introduced, and equation numbers have been aligned to the right. The conclusions has been extended. The list of References has been significantly expanded. They are described in detail, although to a lesser extent this applies to items from the forties and fifties of the twentieth century.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Article should be revised according to the comments above.	The author tried to include all comments of the Reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		