

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_128335
Title of the Manuscript:	Progress in the influence of mechanical sand properties on concrete properties
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of the influence of mechanical sand properties on concrete performance, an important topic in construction and materials engineering. As the demand for high-quality concrete increases, understanding the characteristics of machine-made sand—such as grain shape, grading, and stone powder content—becomes essential for optimizing concrete performance. The findings presented in this paper can help guide future research and practical applications in concrete production, particularly for improving strength, durability, and workability in construction projects. This paper is valuable for both academic researchers and industry professionals working in material science and construction engineering.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 provides a good summary of the paper's content but could be more specific regarding the key findings of the studies reviewed. I suggest adding a brief mention of the major conclusions, such as the optimal stone powder content and the impact of different grain shapes on concrete properties. Suggested additions: "The review highlights the optimal range of stone powder content for improving concrete performance and discusses how particle shape influences workability and strength. The importance of grading and the role of the parent rock in determining concrete properties are also emphasized."	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The paper accurately summarizes existing research and presents a well-structured review of the effects of machine-made sand properties on concrete performance. The studies cited appear to be credible, and the conclusions drawn align with the body of knowledge in the field. However, some clarification or more detailed explanations of certain experimental methods in the referenced studies could improve the clarity for readers unfamiliar with specific techniques.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, and they cover a broad range of studies on the topic. However, the manuscript could benefit from including a few more recent studies (from the last 2-3 years) that address advancements in machine-made sand technology or updated regulations on concrete production.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few sentences that could be rewritten for better clarity and flow. For example, some technical terms may benefit from brief explanations for readers who are not experts in the field of concrete engineering. Minor grammatical corrections should also be made for consistency.	
Optional/General comments	This paper is a valuable contribution to the field of concrete materials science. I would suggest ensuring that all abbreviations are defined when first used (e.g., "WMP" and "SF"). Additionally, while the review covers many aspects of mechanical sand properties, a deeper exploration of how these properties affect the long-term durability of concrete would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topic. Lastly, a section on future research directions could add value by suggesting areas that remain underexplored.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aman Jain
Department, University & Country	MNIT, India