

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_104007
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on the effect of ultra-fine fly ash on the performance of concrete
Type of the Article	Review 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://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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Yes the manuscript is important because the subject is a novel new.</p> <p>2-Yes, it is, but I suggest to change the word: effect, by role, I think is more appropriate.</p> <p>3Yes, it is. Perfectly comprehensive.</p> <p>4-I think all paper is ok. But, I think that one or two illustrations are missing, then their presence could better the article.</p> <p>5-I think, yes. The subject is on time to be researched 5-.</p> <p>6-I have no suggestion to specific research but since the subject is important I think that more citations could better the publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think the english quality is good.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Again, the presentation of some graphics or table, or something that can show the subject in appreciation could reforce the quality of subject.	

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gelsa Edith Navarro Hidalgo
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul, Brazil