

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_75966
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Buildings - a Solution to India's high Energy Consumption
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript language needs a lot of improvement. It is suggested to proof read entire manuscript before re-submission.</p> <p>Sub-heading: 2.6.2.1 Author mentioned the bulk density of Clay fly ash burnt brick as 1.6 g/m³, please re-check this value (it should be 1600 kg/m³ or 1.6 g/cm³)</p> <p>Sub-heading: 2.6.2.2 Author mentioned that Fly ash/sand lime bricks has lower water absorption, but lime has high water absorption capacity, this statement should be re-assessed.</p> <p>Similar for sub-heading 2.6.2.3</p> <p>Water absorption capacity is linked with particle size, smaller the particle size, more will be the water absorption capacity and higher will be the density as well.</p> <p>Author has added many references from Wikipedia and website resources, in academic writing, the only website link is not an authentic source of information. It should be scientific source with proper citation and references as per journal policy. For citation don't have publication year, so it is highly recommended to include only authentic references with proper citation.</p>	<p>Revision amended</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Revised</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In sub heading 3.1, Author mentioned Table 8 in for U values but it should be Table 3 for U values.</p> <p>Please refer to the manuscript, there are some minor comments in manuscript</p>	<p>Done</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Figures quality could be improved.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	