

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_94974</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing Fresh Concrete Performance and Water Absorption Characteristics of Concrete with Partially Replaced Broken Tiles</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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, the manuscript can be useful for scientific society. Initially, the authors are advised to define conditions for future research scope remarks at the end of the abstract section.</p> <p>(2) Title is suitable.</p> <p>(3) It's looks like that abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>(4) The work is fair but the paper needs to be structured properly.</p> <p>(5) Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>(6) Some more references can be added to support the work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>After considering the subject and results, this work entails some new information and could be a merit for publication.</p> <p>English (grammar, style, sentence structure) need to be revised in some sentences of manuscript after careful reading.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Add some latest work in the manuscript.</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><b>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</b></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Shivendra Nandan</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Indian Institute of Technology, India</b>