

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_104953
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of recycled aggregates of concrete and bricks in the central region of Burkina Faso.
Type of the 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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? A) The manuscript presents an empirical proposal. The contribution focused on field survey, interesting. I think authors need to clarify so they can contribute to the literature.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? A) It is adequate, I think that I would not need to present the Characterization of recycled aggregates of concrete and bricks in the central region of Burkina Faso</p> <p>3. Is the article abstract comprehensive? A) No, it is too brief, it does not present the objective, methodological procedures, results and conclusion</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? A) For the empirical study yes, but from the theoretical point of view, it is very succinct</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? A) In an empirical way, it lacks more scientific knowledge</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? A) There are 1/18 in total, a procedure for searching and filtering references was not shown. Since only 4 are references after 2019.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	OK, but needs a review.	
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:	Sérgio Murilo Petri
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil