

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125819
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of rheological properties of steel fiber reinforced concrete
Type of the Article	Opinion Article (An Overview

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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Enriches the domain to some extent but there is an urgent need of further investigations on the topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract needs the addition of brief methodology of Analysis.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Edit one more subtitle of Methodology for analysis. How did the author conduct the analysis and also the comparison table it needs if possible.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision for spellings and punctuation errors	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Abstract and Conclusion is very general some numeric values must be extracted from the reviewed existing research. Methodology may be expressed in flow charts.	

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:	Pushpendra Kumar Sharma
Department, University & Country	Lovely Professional University, India