

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_104300
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing Experimental and Numerical Results for the Structural Properties of Lightweight Ferrocement Beams with Different Core Materials
Type of the 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)
<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</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. I think it could be reformulated to be more professional</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. Not exactly</p> <p>6. Not exactly</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is more or less appropriate for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The research paper suffers from many problems, as all its parts are incomplete from the scientific and linguistic point of view</p> <p>2. The previous research review paragraph is incomplete and needs to be rewritten</p> <p>3. The practical program paragraph is incomplete and needs to be rewritten</p> <p>4. The results paragraph is incomplete, and the results were not analyzed, and no interpretation of the results was mentioned, nor did it mention the practical results</p> <p>5. The conclusions are simple and do not show the main findings of the research.</p> <p>6. There are a lot of grammatical and formatting errors that need to be corrected.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdulrasool Th. Abdulrasool
Department, University & Country	University of Kerbala, Iraq