

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_99019
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance study of Bayer method red mud based controlled low strength alkali inspired concrete
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? The paper deals with Performance study of Bayer method red mud based controlled low strength alkali inspired concrete that is certainly within the scope of this journal. (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Remark 1- The text is generally clear and well-written and, this reviewer can only suggest that it undergoes a major REVISION before of being finally accepted for publication. Particularly, the authors should consider revising the manuscript for grammatical errors and unclear paragraphs. For example the second paragraph of introduction must be improved. Remark 2- The numbering format of the sections must be revised by considering the introduction section in the numbering. Remark 3- The format of the tables should be changed to data visible type instead of picture. Remark 4- In the conclusion section instead of providing detailed information already mentioned in the previous section, it is better to give general information with scientific justification.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ziaaddin Zamanzadeh
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran