

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofProbabilityandStatistics
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJPAS_125479
TitleoftheManuscript:	OPTIMIZATIONOFEXPERIMENTALPARAMETERSINTHEBUILDINGCONSTRUCTIONPROCESSWITHFRACTIONALFACTORIALDESIGNANDRESPONSE SURFACE METHODS
TypeoftheArticle	

PART 1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart in themanuscript.It ismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
Please writeafewsentencesregardingtheimportanc e ofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript? Aminimumof3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.	<p>Thismanuscripthasalotofgrammaticalerrors,formattingerrors,textfontsizeerror,and verypoor presentationof data,whichcanaffectthequalityofthepublication.</p> <p>Forexample: 1)Table1is notjustifiedasthistablehavedifference ineachparametersvalue,which cannotbeimpartedfortheleveldifference.Inhistableitisrequiredtomakeasingleparameter differenceatasingletimeandthustheanalysisconproceedfurtherinthesimilarway.</p> <p>2) Chapter3.2 hasbeenalreadyavailableinthevariousliterature,so whatnewauthorhasdoneinthis.</p> <p>3)Table3isnotevenproperlypresented,eventheauthordidn'tusethe'multiplication' sign.Additionally, theexplanation ofhistableisnotproperlywritten.</p> <p>4) Section4.2,Parameters:Spellingerror"Strength".Additionally,thisis theTablebutauthor didn't mentionasTableandno.numberingisprovided.</p> <p>5)FormulaofCompressivestrengthisnotproperlywritten.Figure1,plotaswellasthewritten textisnot proper.</p> <p>6)Figure3&Figure5, Spellingof'Strength'attopoffigure iswrong.Figure4, Headingatthetopin trimmed.</p> <p>7)NameofAuthors shouldbestartswithCapital alphabet.</p> <p>Only,asinglelatestpaperincludedin reference,howeverallpapersareoldliterature.</p> <p>8)Wrongabbreviationareusedinthewholemanuscript.</p> <p>Inall,if thispapergetpublishedthenitmay affectthequalityofjournal.</p>	<p>The table is justified in the current manuscript</p> <p>The various literature in cooperate the use of a single method only for optimization .while in this current manuscript we used to method i.e fractional factorial design for screening out the influential factors on compressive strength and Response surface methodology for the optimization process. For more details refer to section 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>The table is clearly presented and the use of multiplication sign is applied in the current manuscript.</p> <p>Spelling error of "strength is corrected in the updated manuscript</p> <p>All other minor corrections are corrected in the updated version of the manuscript</p>
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	Titleisnotsuitableasnothingoptimization hasbeendoneinthisanalysis.	<p>Optimization was successfully achieved through the adjustment of three critical variables: standard sand size, water-cement ratio, and type of cement. The optimal standard sand size was determined to be 20 mm, within the tested range of 16 to 20 mm, suggesting that larger sand particles contribute to increased strength. The water-cement ratio was optimized at 0.5, the upper limit of its range (0.4 to 0.5), which balanced hydration and minimized excess water that could weaken the mix. The type of cement, represented as (-1, 1), was optimized at 1, corresponding to the BUA cement type, which had the most positive impact on compressive strength.</p> <p>For more details refer to the discussion of table 4 in the updated manuscript.</p>
Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Do you suggesttheaddition (ordeletion)ofsomepointsinthis section?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.	Abstractiscomprehensivebutvariousgrammaticalerrorsandnotationerror.	Grammatical errors and notation error are noted and updated in the updated version of the manuscript.
Aresubsectionsandstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?	Notappropriate	

ReviewForm3

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I didn't think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. As the approach has been already available in the literature and it looks like various manipulations have been done with the data. Additionally, the presentation of paper is very bad. I recommend the author to rewrite the manuscript again by taking proper time and resubmit again.	All corrections noted and corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are very less and only one latest reference has been used in the whole manuscript.	Noted and the reference are updated to more recent work .
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, various grammatical mistakes are in the manuscript.	
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)	