

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_104300</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparing Experimental and Numerical Results for the Structural Properties of Lightweight Ferrocement Beams with Different Core Materials</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. As my point of view the manuscript important for scientific community</p> <p>2. It is better to say "Comparative study on the Structural Properties of Lightweight Ferrocement Beams with Different Core Materials; In case for Experimental and Numerical Results"</p> <p>3. Abstract section too long, author's need to summery the experimental methodology presented there and shown the important findings.</p> <p>4. The manuscript was structure and subsections appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. All references included in this manuscript were recent, but not sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, Language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. What types of mix design employed in this manuscript? Amount of material like silica fume and fly ash....?</p> <p>2. Author have not mentioned the maximum size of coarse aggregate. The particular size distribution curve for both fine and coarse aggregate must be mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. How the admixture was taken, was it taken by weight of cement? What is chemical property of it? How much water reduction was considered?</p> <p>4. Result presented at a Comparison between the Experimental and Theoretical Results part should need explanation i.e. Figures and Table.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ashenafi Tofu Chofore</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</b>