

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_114400
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Research on Recycled Aggregate Concrete Filled Steel Tube
Type of the Article	Review paper

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>Partial</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It can be rewritten for better highlighting of work</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, But the authors have not included recently published papers</p> <p>Nil</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. Grammatical corrections neds to be checked</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The authors must explain the methodology of selection of articles for review process. The authors should check other review papers.</p> <p>2. The objective of the review is not mentioned.</p> <p>3. The review is of significance to research fraternity; however, the authors seem to just collect the conclusions from the research papers. The authors comments are not significantly highlighted.</p> <p>4. The references in the text are not of same format. The authors must adopt the format provided by the journal</p> <p>5. Continuing the point 2, authors should check the references subtopic as well.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight
--	--------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

		<i>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:	Preeti Kulkarni
Department, University & Country	Vishwakarma Institute of Information Technology, India