

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129347
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Models for the Prediction of Mechanical Properties of Concrete using Bida Natural Stones 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>

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 manuscript is related to the use of local aggregate from (Bida) city as a coarse aggregate to produce structural concrete. The mechanical properties were tested and evaluated. The author(s) have predicted the mechanical properties of this concrete depending on a statistical approach. The importance of this paper is based on using an available local aggregate to produce more sustainable and economical concrete. In addition to the adoption of algorithmic research to predict the mechanical properties of concrete.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is directly related to the manuscript content.	
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 of the article is a comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Generally, the manuscript is complying with the scientific research. There are some notes, suggestions, and questions presented in the attached file.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are lack in the references. Most the references are old. The author(s) should cited up to date references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the 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 detail)</i> According to my past reviews , There are not any ethical issues in this manuscript	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	According to my past reviews , There are not any competing interest issues in this manuscript	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>		

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	Minor revision (8 – 9)

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Mahmood Fawzi Ahmed
Department of Reviewer	Education department of Hit
University or Institution of Reviewer	General Directorate of Education in Anbar
Country of Reviewer	Iraq
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Lecturer
Email ID of Reviewer	mahmodmfa81@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Concrete technology – geopolymers – recycled aggregate – sustainability – high performance concrete – durability