



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_29586
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental Study of Thermophysical and Mechanical Properties of Refractory Clay tilled into Straw-Fiber Stabilized Blocks
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors used several words describing the same material: refractory clay tilled, clay, raw soil, raw mud, or even earth and land. They should choose one of them for better clarity. 2. Word “however” is misused in the sentence “However it increases the heat capacity...” in the abstract. An increase of heat capacity is a positive effect in terms of building materials. 3. F_c and R_c, F_f and R_f factors should not be described the same. For F_c and F_f factors I propose “maximum compression force” and “maximum flexural force” descriptions respectively. 4. In the abstract the authors state that drying shrinkage of the samples increased by 22.25% when in fact it decreased. 5. “Bending strength” is misused with “Flexural strength” and “breaking load” descriptions. 6. In the experimental part “power” is misused with “load” in the description of mechanical tester. 7. In 3.1.2. point the authors state that increase of tensile strength causes an increase of flexibility of the material, which is not always true. In my opinion these two factors should be interpreted separately. 	<p>We sincerely thank you for your amendments which helped to improve the quality of our manuscript.</p> <p>All your amendments are fair so we built them.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the nomenclature “drying shrinking” should have % unit. 	<p>Your comments are relevant and we have taken them into account.</p> <p>concerning the comment (2. The experimental</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The experimental part sometimes contain description of the samples properties, which should be located in the results & discussion part and <i>vice versa</i>. 3. The T_c and T_f factors are not described in the nomenclature. 4. The sentence "...,on the one hand, and on the other hand,..." is confusing in "3.1. Hydro-mechanical properties" section. In my opinion it should be removed. 5. In the table 5 an error of water absorption is confusing (20%) when compared to the absorption values (11.36-21.25). What are the units of these values? 6. In 3.2.2.1. point, the density decrease of the samples should be also connected with lower density of straw in comparison to clay. 7. In table 7 word "effusivité" should be replaced by "effusivity" 	<p>part sometimes contain description of the samples properties, which should be located in the results & discussion part and <i>vice versa</i>.), we believe that the "materials and methods" is to present the material (eg material) and to describe the methodology used to determine the deferent properties. That is why we have shown for each property how we have determined them. Hence their description</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a number of editorial issues mainly concerning lack of spaces between words in sentences. 	<p>Yes, it is for the junction of the file that certain spaces are removed</p>