

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_103712
Title of the Manuscript:	INCORPORATING RICE HUSK ASH IN METAKAOLIN-BASED GEOPOLYMER BINDER.
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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community since provides an viable alternative to develop waste-based sustainable building materials.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some minor corrections are highlighted in colour.</p> <p>5. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, some suggestions are marked in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Corrections are highlighted in the attached document. In green colour, suggested corrections are marked. In yellow colour, it is highlighted what of the original text must be revised and blue colour some comments to take in account.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English is good (please see the revised manuscript).	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	None	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jairo Antonio Cubillos Lobo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia