



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_43352
Title of the Manuscript:	PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF ORDINARY PORTLAND CEMENT WITH SAW DUST ASH IN CONCRETE
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There is need for the authors to give details of the experimental methods they used especially in the determination of the chemical contents of SDA and OPC. There is need of the results of compressive strength for the control sample (0% SDA) to compare with those of the substituted cement)	Reviewer's comments are welcomed. Thank you for your comment. We have tried to improve the manuscript as per your suggestion.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		