

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121670
Title of the Manuscript:	Strengthening method of waste concrete aggregate
Type of the Article	Opinion 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 <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 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.	he manuscript on the "Strengthening method of waste concrete aggregate" holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue in sustainable construction practices. By providing innovative techniques to enhance the properties of waste concrete aggregate, the study contributes to reducing environmental impact and promoting the recycling of construction materials.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Acceptable	
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.	Acceptable	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Acceptable	
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 on the "Strengthening method of waste concrete aggregate" appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach in addressing the issue. Additionally, the manuscript's alignment with existing literature and its contribution to advancing knowledge in sustainable construction practices further support its scientific correctness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hajir A Al-Hussainy
Department, University & Country	Kerbalaa University, Iraq