



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_29393
Title of the Manuscript:	THERMOMECHANICAL CHARACTERISATION OF COMPRESSED EARTH BLOCKS ADDED WITH SAWDUST
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	• Abstract needs to be re-written. There is a risk of confusion here – the Author keeps talking about a composite equipment instead of a composite material i.e. compressed earth block/saw dust. • Nomenclature: Manner of presentation is quite unusual; a tabular format as used by Author is novel to me!! • Introduction: This is not clear at all. The grammar is very poor and there are lots of confusing facts. • Materials and Methods: This is broken into far too many tiny sub-sections e.g. Sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.5 need to be re-written. Each sub-section at present is very brief, hence there is no real flow. It might be better if these sub-sections were omitted, and possibly one or two paragraphs constructed instead in order to bring about some flow. • There are other sub-sub-sections which are not properly delineated or marked out as such e.g. Line 88, Line 95, Line 100, etc. • There are a lot of odd or incorrect sentences. These do not make for a good read, e.g. Lines 106-107; Lines 117-118; Lines 122-125; Lines 138-139; Lines 164-166. • Figures 1 and 2 are not directly referred to in the text. They should!!	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• In Figure 10 there are no indications of what the x and y – axes represent. In addition one can hardly make out what the individual curves represent as the legends are unclear or too small. • References: Most are in French. If there had been only 2 –3 references in French, this could have been overlooked. However there are at least 8 references in French. I would advise that the English translations of all references should be shown in brackets as well, after each French reference.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	➤ Poor grammar throughout – obviously Author's first language is not English!! ➤ There are some odd or puzzling words and phrases throughout e.g. Line 21 – “locate equipment”; Line 26 – “adjuvant”; Line 36 – “out”; Line 59 – “we interested”; Line 67 – “had consisted on soaking”; Line 79 – “Test realization (BTC)”; Line 83 – “lagers”; Line 87 – “confection”; Line 95 – Massic”. ➤ Line 139 – ARS 681(1996) is not in the References. ➤ Line 145 – NFP 11-300 is not in the References. ➤ Line 150 – NFP 15-301 is not in the References. ➤ Line 163 – ARS 675: 1996 is not in the References. ➤ Line 162 – Solomon-Ayeh [5] in text is entered as [11] in the References. ➤ Line 173 – “until” should be “up to”. ➤ Line 175 – “Peller” is indicated; however in References the name is “Peltier”. ➤ Line 216 – “rhetorical” should probably be “theoretical” ➤ Figures 8 and 9 would need to be discussed or commented on a bit more. At present the comments on Figures 8 and 9 are a bit scanty or too brief. ➤ In Lines 221 – 223, one is perplexed what relevance “building N^o 11 CDI and CRA Terre-EAG March 1996” has in the Conclusions.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The whole 3 lines taken together appear very odd. ➤ Lines 230 – “By elsewhere” is wrong phraseology or wording surely!!	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	❖ Throughout the text all figures should be referred to as Figure 1, 2, etc. and not figure 1, 2, etc. The same should apply for all tables.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shodolapo Oluyemi Franklin
Department, University & Country	Department of Civil Engineering, University of Botswana, Botswana