

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	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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 valuable insights into a previously unexplored area of research, potentially paving the way for future studies and advancements. The findings presented could significantly contribute to the current body of knowledge and offer new perspectives for both researchers and practitioners. Furthermore, the methodologies and approaches used in this study could serve as a benchmark for similar future research, enhancing the overall quality and rigor of scientific investigations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Its good.	
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, it's good.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-The manuscript adds scientific value to the community, particularly with the use of a new type of aggregate. - It is preferable to create more than 20 mixtures to achieve more accurate empirical formulas, although the margin of error is small and the current formulas are good.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussein Sadiq Latief
Department, University & Country	Southern Technical University, Iraq