

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96716
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF THE STRENGTH OF BLOCKS MADE FROM SHARP SAND CEMENT, LATERITE CEMENT AND RED EARTH CEMENT
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>(1) Yes, the manuscript can be useful for scientific society. Initially, the authors are advised to define conditions for future research scope remarks at the end of the abstract section.</p> <p>(2) Title can be modified.</p> <p>(3) It's looks like that abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>(4) The work is fair but the paper needs to be structured properly.</p> <p>(5) Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>(6) Some more literature can be added in introduction to support the work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>After considering the subject, this work entails some new information of review and could be a merit for publication.</p> <p>English (grammar, style, sentence structure) need to be revised in some sentences of manuscript after careful reading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Add some latest work in the manuscript.</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:	Shivendra Nandan
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology, India