



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_CJAST_12078
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF ROOF FAILURES IN AND AROUND IBADAN, NIGERIA: CAUSES, EFFECTS AND REMEDY
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 methodology does not clearly describe what was done, the study site, what types of analyzes were done and in what consisted the interviews, group discussion and personal observations. The methodological procedures need to be better explained, because there is no sufficient details of the methods / process provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described. The test to ensure reliability of the results does not make sense, since in the methodology were also not explained as analyzes would be performed. How did Table 1 was elaborated? What were the criteria? Its contents are not presented in the analysis, since general causes of the roof failures were not the same in Figure 1. Furthermore, the criteria for analysis of the roof failure should be in the methodology.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the Introduction, the fourth and fifth paragraphs (line 46-76) have no connection with the first three paragraphs (line 19-45), so it should be rewritten. Also in the fifth paragraph, it is not clear where attempts to solve the problems of failed roofs were performed. The objectives of this work should be written in another way, for better closure of the ideas in the Introduction.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	With the great confusion in methodology and presentation/ discussion of the results, the conclusion was impaired. The article should be rewritten as a whole to have greater clarity.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Grace Tibério Cardoso de Seixas</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>School of Engineering of São Carlos, University of São Paulo, Brazil</i>