

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	

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.	In this article, the authors explored the analytical models for the compressive, flexural and splitting tensile strengths of concretes. The article looks nice and will be useful for the readers. From the strength data obtained, regression equations were developed that relate the strength properties with the aid of regression analysis tools.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, 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.	Yes, abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, some typo can be corrected.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, sufficient enough few suggested can be added.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is correct.	
Optional/General comments	Some prediction models are presented in the attached articles. Please check and provide models from these articles. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.ukm.my/jsm/pdf_files/SM-PDF-46-4-2017/18%20Jin%20Chai%20Lee.pdf https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652616001207	

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:

Name:	Muhammad Aslam
Department, University & Country	Wenzhou University of Technology, China