



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_49364
Title of the Manuscript:	Laboratory Testing on the Promotion of Madagascar's Industrial Waste and Natural Materials as a Clinker Mineralizer
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Page 2, line 46. It is suggested to change the word "Cemetery" for "Cement Industry"</p> <p>Page 3. Table 1. In the title it is indicated that the values are in mass percent, though these values do not sum the 100 percent.</p> <p>Page 3. Table 2. It is indicated that the content of the bale are results. Why including results in a section of materials and methods.</p> <p>Page 3. Figure 1. This figure does not indicates the different temperatures applied.</p> <p>Figures 2, 3 and 4 are not cited in text. They must. Also they must indicate de units. This commentary applies for all the results.</p> <p>Avoid using expressions as "the following" page 4 line 126 or "as above" page 5 line 137, you must cited all figures in text.</p> <p>Page 9, line 226. "Competition has become increasingly fierce in the cement production market" Eliminate this phrase. The investigation does not gives support to it.</p> <p>The conclusion does not support clearly the objective been stated at the end of the introduction. What was the best mineralizer, In order to reduce energy budgets?</p>	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Enrique Rico García
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, México