

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_129090
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF RICE HUSK REINFORCEMENT ON COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF EARTH BLOCKS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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.	Authors explored the rammed earth blocks using rice husk ash. The work is interesting for low-cost village houses. It is interesting field, but the provided article is very short and very limited study is provided.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is suitable.	
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.	Yes, Abstract is suitable.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, overall looks nice, few typo and grammar errors should be rechecked and removed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, Okay.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the article is nice, but very short and limited data is provided. I suggest add more literature review and comparison with previous studies. In addition, results should be explained in more details. Only compressive strength is provided which is not sufficient. Provide more discussions of the results.	

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:	Muhammad Aslam
Department, University & Country	College of Architecture and Energy Engineering, Wenzhou University of Technology, China