

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_118287
Title of the Manuscript:	Progress of Research on Freeze-Thaw Damage of Rubber Recycled Concrete
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://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. Abstract looks like an introduction and does not contain important analytical finding of manuscript. Spelling mistakes are also there.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. There is factual incorrectness. Introduction does not encompass progress in recycling activities of C&D waste and rubber tyres and need of rubber blending to concrete. Orientation for importance of rubberised concrete is required.</p> <p>Inadequate references are provided in introduction section. The paper starts with environmental issue and landed on freeze thaw mechanism. Thus direction of review is skewed.</p> <p>The authors have focussed more on freeze thaw damage mechanism in general rather than implication with mixing of rubber/ rubber fibres, strength comparison, potential benefits, etc. The focus should be more inclined on rubber mixing and problem it solves and views of author.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, except some grammatical mistakes and spellings such as tyres.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author has raised important issue and its solutions which will have positive impact on environment and society. However, latest development in available literature in this field is required to be referred constructively with more focus on rubberised recycled concrete rather than in general recycled concrete.</p> <p>However, the manuscript can be made better by the author making it for publication by including their own understanding, findings in a table, application experience for rubberised tyre in a pilot and also commercially which is sporadically available in literature)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Arvind Kumar Jha
Department, University & Country	India