

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_86581
Title of the Manuscript:	Response Surface Methodology and its Application in Evaluating Scientific Activities of Federal University
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:

(<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The manuscript contains sufficient materials to be published, but the presentation of the materials is too weak to be considered a scientific or academic article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introductory section contains many citations absent in the reference list. For example, Box and Wilson (1951); Box and Behnken (1960); Hartley 91959). Also, a few references are listed but not cited in the reference list. Also, the list concentrated only in the introductory section. Other section has no citation, making the work warranted on many fronts. They need to work extensively on referring to earlier literature. 2. Results and Discussion sections must include the descriptions of all the figures. The figures are plotted, but no discussion on scientific outcome was attempted in the manuscript. 3. The listed recommendations in the last section are too general, reducing the impact of the study significantly. The authors need to remove the recommendation part and combine it with the conclusion section, considering it is a scientific article and not meant for funding purposes. 4. There is a general feeling that the manuscript is for specialised readers. They need to approach it for the general reader, at least in the abstract section, so that a non-specialised reader can get some feel of their work. 5. Extensive language correction is essential throughout the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pranaba K Nayak
Department, University & Country	Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, India