

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_128898
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sodium Silicate on the Properties of Wood Ash in a Blended Cement Concrete
Type of the 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.	The study of wood ash and sodium silicate in blended cement concrete is crucial for the scientific community as it offers a sustainable and environmentally friendly alternative to traditional concrete materials. This research has significant implications for the construction industry, as it can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, conserve natural resources, and promote waste reduction.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article 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.	The abstract is well-written and comprehensive, but here are some suggestions for improvement: Additions (1. Specifically state the research objective, 2. Provide more context on the sustainability aspect, 3. Mention the significance of the LSTM model). Deletions (1. Remove the phrase "a sustainable alternative to Portland cement", 2. Omit the specific values for R ² , MAE, and RMSE).	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct but can be presented in the following order: 1. Introduction, 2. Literature review, 3. Methodology, 4. Results, 5. Discussion, 6. Conclusion and Recommendations, 7. References.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient but not too recent. More recent references can be added.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English is suitable for scholarly communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have some potential concerns such as: 1. Lack of detail on wood ash characterization, 2. Unclear dosage ranges, 3. insufficient information on the LSTM model.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sani Aliyu
Department, University & Country	Kampala International University, Uganda