

## 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | 1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</b><br><br>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article was suitable</b><br><br>3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article was comprehensive</b><br><br>4. <b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate</b><br><br>5. <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically acceptable</b><br><br>6. <b>Yes, the References are sufficient and few references are recent</b> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | Yes, the quality of English language of the article was suitable for scholarly communications.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The concept of paper was Good</li> <li>■ The presentation of paper was Good</li> <li>■ The quality of article was Fair.</li> </ul>  |   |

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Name:</b>                                | <b>T. Phani Madhavi</b>                   |
| <b>Department, University &amp; Country</b> | <b>Bapatla Engineering College, India</b> |