

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_128549
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF A DURABLE RECREATIONAL SEAT USING REINFORCED CONCRETE
Type of the Article	Experimental analysis

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.	The work is of very ordinary quality with very little focus on value addition to technical community. Such work is very common in precast concrete construction industry. The result of 28 days compressive strength is must to mention.	
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.	Abstract is not up to expectations. Need to be written more precisely focusing on major extract of the work.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Can't decide as the work is partially completed demonstrating 7-day compressive strength only.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Total number of references are sufficient. But citing the eferences in the body of manuscript is missing.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is fair for the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need to work more with final product details and its assessment.	

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:	Manoj Hirji Mota
Department, University & Country	Shivaji University, India