

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_103904
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and characterizations of sodium gluconate and study of its effects on the properties of Ordinary Portland cement as a retarding admixture
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.journalirpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/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) it is important to know the classification and parameters of materials according to their characteristics, properties, uses and specifications.</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? no</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? yes</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? yes</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>The following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The summary should be improved because it is ambiguous, in addition, it should contain more tangible data of the results obtained. - It should offer a deeper vision, which addresses, reviews and analyzes the causes and effects of what it proposes. - The bibliography should be updated because there is little updated bibliography and it should be increased much more to be treated. - Regarding the objective of the work, it should be highlighted, as well as the working hypothesis. On the other hand, emphasis should be given to the innovation of the work and its specific contribution, in addition, the methodology section should be improved and clearly stated, the discussion of results should be separated, the conclusions should be improved (clarify the characterization section because it is ambiguous and rearrange it in the text). <p>- It should be discussed more in the text the formulas and the present results, and it is recommended to add tables with data that allow comparison and that are in an adequate format, it is recommended to discuss its role in the gluconate mechanism, for example the relationships with the tobermorite are not mentioned, nor other parameters of mineral phases that could distort the resistance results, neither the model presented in figure 6 is satisfactorily explained, and its influence in the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Juan Hernández Ávila
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of the State of Hidalgo, México