

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JMSRR_103057 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Research progress on the interface between ultra-high performance concrete and ordinary concrete |
| Type of the Article | Minireview 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</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?</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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. This research is especially important with UHPC-NC technology. Need to be developed in a tropical environment.</p> <p>2. Progress on the interface between ultra-high performance concrete and ordinary concrete (The title omits the word "research")</p> <p>3. Less complete. The goals are not specific, the discussion is lacking and the results are not complete</p> <p>4. It is appropriate, but the research method is not described step by step.</p> <p>5. Already correct</p> <p>6. Reference is quite good and up to date.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. Sufficiently Appropriate, I have notes on the Manuscript that need to be corrected. (yellow)</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The manuscript is good, but it needs further discussion in terms of content which is less sharp in analysis.</p> | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Syaiful |
| Department, University & Country | Ibn Khaldun University, Indonesia |