Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_96499**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessing Compressive Strength of Concrete with Waste Automobile Tire and Palm Kernel shells as Aggregates**
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://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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript shows experimental research related to the properties of concrete aggregated with waste automobile tire and palm kernel shells. The paper is surely very interesting, properly performed and important to many readers and to the overall scientific community.** **2. The title of the article is suitable.** **3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and properly performed.** **4. Sections/Subsections and paper structure are appropriate.** **5. I believe that the manuscript is scientifically correct.** **6. The paper is well referenced, but the references are dominantly older than 5 or 10 years. So the Authors should add in the paper more recent literature in this research field (mentioned also in my additional comments).** **Additional comments:** 1. The Authors should add to the list of references more recent literature from this research field, because used literature is dominantly older than 5 or 10 years. 2. In the paper text are missing some calls on the figures – for example, call on Fig. 5 is missing in the paper text. Please, check the entire paper and correct if any call on the Figure or Table is missing in the paper text. 3. Throughout the paper text can be found some obvious and typing mistakes – all of them should be corrected during the revision process.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	-	

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Vedran Mrzljak**
Department, University & Country	**University of Rijeka, Croatia**