

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_129182
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of the application of Bayer red mud in concrete
Type of the Article	Commentary

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.	This ms have address the sustainability issues in the application of industrial waste namely Bayer red mud as fillers/ aggregates in concrete material production. By reviewing the material's properties, processing methods, and its impact on concrete performance, the study contributes to advancing sustainable practices in construction and waste management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good but it is suggested to add some more words related to sustainability, waste management, or future potential to make it more visible among researchers. May be "Advancing Sustainable Construction: A Review of Bayer Red Mud Applications in Concrete" can be one of the option.	
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.	Definitely the abstract must be added with some more points because I couldn't found something about the key findings or insights from the review. For instance, mentioning the most promising application or the major limitation of Bayer red mud in concrete could make the abstract more engaging	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided content, but it could benefit from deeper critical analysis and clarity in methodology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I would suggest adding some more references for a review paper. First number of references should be at least 25. Secondly, for a review paper, please add more in text citation style rather than put it in the end of a sentence (According to....., Based on study by....., Have been reported by....., etc).	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and understandable	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The used of abbreviation for RM. Please declared it as red mud (RM) as it first appear in the manuscript. 2. Fore citation, add some more on explaining alumina refining process, add some more to support author's claimed that red mud is harmful. 3. May be rephrase some of the technical information in section 2 and 3 to make it more like a research paper rather than textbook explanation. 4. Add table in section 3 to differentiate various methods from various researchers in improving the reactivity of red mud. 5. Add bar chart in section 4 to show comparison in mechanical properties of concrete mixed with bayer red mud from literatures. 6. Lastly in the conclusion section, please highlight gap/ weakness based on recent reports on RM study for concrete application. Then, recommend some potential study to close the gap. 	

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:	Muhamad Soffi Manda
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Sultan Haji Ahmad Shah, Malaysia