

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99400
Title of the Manuscript:	PROPERTIES OF SELF COMPACTING CONCRETE CONTAINING SILICA FUME AS A SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVE: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1) This manuscript is of relative interest to the scientific community. 2) Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3) Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but I recommend greater care in the presentation of texts and figures. 5) I suggest that the author should comment on the results of the references presented to make the article more scientifically consistent. 6) The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. The language/English quality is suitable for scholarly communications. Minor revision is recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carlos Fernando de Araújo Calado
Department, University & Country	University of Pernambuco, Brazil