

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129536
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Relationship between Compressive, Flexural and Splitting Tensile Strengths of Concrete Containing Kuta Gravel as Coarse Aggregate
Type of the Article	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>

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 research work is carried in better way for sustainable development by replacing waste materials in concrete manufacturing	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for this research	
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	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes it is acceptable, the work is done for mechanical properties comparison	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient, need to add few more in future work	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The overall research work was carried out in better way 1. Compare the density of concrete after fresh state properties for conventional aggregates with Kuta Gravel 2. Why 100mm×100mm×500mm (beam samples) were used, please clarify the span by depth ratio 3. Compare the mechanical properties and strength values for different mix 4. The equation . is whether cross verified as per standard codes followed in your country 5. Load versus deflection behaviour for beams not mentioned clearly 6. Which grade of concrete is used for testing 7. Whether different mix of concrete is used or not for results comparison. 8. On what basis only regression analysis and empirical relation only followed for results comparison	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>A.Mohan</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>Easwari Engineering College, India</u>