

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_104893</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Sawdust and Coconut Shell on the Mechanical Properties of Concrete</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</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. YES</p> <p>2. YES</p> <p>3. NO</p> <p>4. YES</p> <p>5. YES</p> <p>6. YES</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NO	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Suggestions to enhance the work's quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract does not address concrete production costs.</li> <li>• In the introduction, authors do not clearly identify the gap being filled. Has simultaneous use of sawdust and coconut husk been studied before? If so, at what proportions?</li> <li>• In the Materials and Methods section, the rationale for selecting the cement type is not explained. Is it the most common in the region? More cost-effective?</li> <li>• In Table 1, significant variation in values is observed. Does the low specific mass and density of alternative aggregates compromise mechanical performance? At what proportions? Does the high absorption greatly affect concrete workability and porosity? Please elaborate.</li> <li>• The results lack discussion in relation to prior publications. Were the variations/reductions significant? I believe so. I suggest using the Student's t-test for validation.</li> <li>• The cost of concrete with alternative aggregates was lower, but is this compensatory despite the reduction in performance? What is the source of the unit cost data used? Please specify.</li> <li>• In the conclusions, how can it be asserted that it can be used as lightweight concrete? Were the mechanical performance values compared to standardized minimum limits for this type of concrete? What percentage of alternative aggregate would you recommend for use? Please provide more specific guidance.</li> </ul>	

[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>Osires de Medeiros Melo Neto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Campina Grande, Brazil</b>