

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125819
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of rheological properties of steel fiber reinforced concrete
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript has good scientific ideas but it should be improved 1. The English language should be improved it does not much scientific writing language. 2. The font of the article should be in uniform example the abstract is in "Arial format" while the main body is in New Times Roman	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article needs to be modified as follows. The rheological properties of steel fiber-reinforced concrete have a significant impact on the engineering aspect. Experimental characterization of the rheological properties of steel fiber-reinforced concrete has a vital effect and value in concrete scientific research. The article compares and analyzes the construction characteristics and applicable scope of commonly used concrete rheometers, and analyzes the influence of factors such as water-cement ratio, mineral admixtures, aggregate properties, steel fiber properties, and additives on the rheological performance test results. The finding results(result is missing should be added here) This can provide a reference for the selection of rheological performance testing methods and parameter control of steel fiber-reinforced concrete.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I suggest all subsections should be divided to Abstracts, 1. Introduction 2. Methodology. 3. Results and discussion 4. Conclusion. All other subsections should fall under this section	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript technically has a good scientific sound but doesn't have strong novelty, the introduction is too short and should be improved to at least 2 pages 1. describing previous research on concrete rheological challenges. 2. Emphasizing why steel fiber has to be implemented in concrete	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference and introduction should added.	
Minor REVISION comments	Major revisions and the English language should be modified	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I suggest the main revision of this paper and if strongly modified it can be accepted for publishing	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edwin Ernest Nyakilla
Department, University & Country	Peking University Ordos Research Institute of Energy, China