

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Physical Science International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_PSIJ_112918 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Study of The Influence of Storage Media on the Thermo-Mechanical Behavior of Concrete and Cement Blocks |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. Yes. The authors selected three environments for storing specimens after curing the materials, reflecting the actual conditions under which the material structures were installed. The manuscript concluded that the behaviour of materials is greatly influenced by variations in climatic parameters. This has important implications for finding a material that consumes less energy, is thermally suitable, and is more resistant to external pressures.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. No. The abstract should comprise of and the following are noted: A concise background and objective of the study (missing) Methods/techniques used/adopted to achieve results (included, but need coherence and articulation) Overarching result(s), conclusion(s) and recommendation(s); (recommendations not well articulated).</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No. Literature should be improved. Maybe add some recent review papers about storage environments on the thermal and mechanical properties of concrete and cement blocks.</p> <p>Additional suggestions</p> <p>1. The introduction part is not well articulated. What is the novelty of your work? How it is better than the work published by the others?</p> <p>2. Most of the figures are qualitative (figures 1-5) and do not provide data. I suggest delete them.</p> <p>3. In order to fully verify the author's conclusion, samples storing in an environment that complies with standard norms can be used as a control.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | No. The coherence of the manuscript is poor with inappropriate choice of words. I suggest for somebody who is well versed in English to double check it. | |
| 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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Ning Wang |
| Department, University & Country | College of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Shandong University of Science and Technology, China |