

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_94313
Title of the Manuscript:	RECYCLING OF WASTE PLASTIC FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ROAD INTERLOCKING PAVING STONE IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research

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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>Dear Authors; Several critical comments should be addressed before making decision about this manuscript. Please highlight the revision parts in the revised manuscript. The following main comments are presented below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract should be re-written in order to increase the readership. Its structure is not suitable and comprehensible. • In the current manuscript, some sentences are very long, and readers cannot understand their concepts easily. • The grammatical points should be checked and revised by native speaker. • The results should be quantified in the abstract. • The keywords should be ranked based on high importance. • The history of research should be expressed chronologically. • The background of this research should be presented until 2022. • Please pay more attention to the abbreviations. • The research flowchart should be added. • The images of experimental materials should be presented in the revised manuscript. • Please elaborate the mix design. • Compressive strength test should be elaborated based on experimental images. • The results should be discussed more among this research and the related past researches. • The limitations of this work should be presented in the manuscript. • The reviewer believes that results of this paper reports only the differences in the observation without detailed descriptions of reasons and stays quite superficial. • The conclusion section needs to be re-written conceptually with regarding to findings of this research. Please present the results conceptually and specify the important results. Meanwhile, the recommendation section should be added to the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abbasali Sadeghi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Islamic Republic of Iran