

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_119011
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Burnt Sawdust Ash from Timber Species on the Chemical Strength Properties of Laterite-interlocking Blocks
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is significant for the scientific community, especially for researchers and practitioners in the construction industry as it addresses the pressing need for sustainable and affordable building materials by investigating the use of burnt sawdust ash (BSDA)</p> <p>The title is generally suitable, but it could be made more concise if necessary</p> <p>The abstract is ok but could be refined. It provides a good overview of the study's aim, methodology, and key findings but should avoid redundancy. Optimum replacement percentage could be mentioned. The word "Scanning Electron Microscopy" is mentioned twice in the keywords section.</p> <p>The paper is well-organized with clear sections for introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound</p> <p>References seem to be sufficient, but if you could identify and involve more papers published in 2022, 2023 or within the past 3-4 years. it would enhance the relevance and enlighten the readers about the recent developments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is good. There are also minor grammatical errors and typographical errors that need to be corrected. "odinary" should be "ordinary," and "canstruction" should be "construction."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>et al. Should be in italics. It would be helpful to include a section discussing the practical implications of using BSDA in construction, such as cost savings, environmental impact, and potential barriers to implementation.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Soorya M. Nair
Department, University & Country	Jyothi Engineering College, India