

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_120414
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF PADDY STRAW IN CONCRETE- A BRIEF REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript captures the attention of utilizing waste to valuable commercial products. The way the manuscript is written needs to be changed with elaborations on some sections as highlighted	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be recasted to probably Use of rice straws in the construction industry and future prospects for environmental sustainability	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is still scanty and doesn't bring out the message clearly	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. for instance, no section indicates the protocol used to screen literature which is pertinent for the review	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript has glaring gaps that must addressed to make it robust. Comments for this have been indicated	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Recent literature was rarely used and this must be addressed by the author	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English was relatively good but lacked coherence	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript must be rewritten to address the comments raised	

Review Form 3

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:	Mwesigwa Robert
Department, University & Country	National Livestock Resources Research Institute (NaLIRRI), Uganda