

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_96042
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICAL AND GEOMETRICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF REINFORCING STEEL BARS IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY OF GHANA
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://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)
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)	<p>This is a comparative study of steel bars of different companies. It may be interested to the end user rather scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Good</p> <p>Kankam C.K. and Adom-Asamoah M if these two people are authors means, most of them are self-citation. Need more references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Appropriate	
Optional/General comments	1. Result and Discussion part need improvement. This looks like just A to B comparison and no scientific reason or hypothesis reported. 2. Conclusion look very general. Expecting specific conclusion	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p><i>It is a comparative study of 4 different companies' product and the name of the companies were mentioned. This may be coming under ethical issue and may guide a particular product promotion as well. Even though author(s) saying there is no commitment behind this study, but somehow may reflect in promotion end of the day.</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Senthil Vadivel
Department, University & Country	Adamas University, India