

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_101713
Title of the Manuscript:	MEASUREMENT OF THE THERMAL CONDUCTIVITIES OF CLAY MATERIALS STABILIZED BY A MIXED BINDER
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:

(<https://www.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, but the author does not show the importance in the abstract.</p> <p>2. No, I think it is better A Consistent Comparison of the Thermal Conductivities of Clay Materials Stabilized by a Mixed Binders</p> <p>3. No, the abstract does not give a hint about the outcomes of this research. For instant, a sentence like "A new formulation of clay is invented to measure the enhancement of thermal conductivity".</p> <p>4. No, Section 2 does not show the method well-enough.</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but not recent.</p> <p>Literature review is not enough. Method of measuring the thermal conductivity is not clear and the author does not verify the accuracy of the measuring procedure. The figures do not add to the manuscript and some figures (Fig.2) are confusing. The language of some figures (Fig.3) are not English.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. NO</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs major revision and from my point of view the manuscript is not suitable to be published.</p>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Essam Shaban</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Helwan University, Egypt</b>