

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_77060
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Calcination on the Chemical and Microstructural Properties of Rice Husk Ash
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authors concluded that Rice Husk Ash (RHA) can be used as a substituted with cement in concrete for minimizing the greenhouse gasses emissions from cement industry as well as for achieving high strength concrete. Thus, it is necessary for authors to proof this statement by conducting the properties of real sample of cement in concrete, then compare with the prepared RHA's properties.</li> <li>Authors claimed that the rice husk calcined at controlled burning temperature of 600°C-800°C for different duration of burning of 8, 16 and 24 hour. The brand, model, country with the function of temperature-controlled program for the furnace used must be provided. The furnace shown in Fig 1 seems without a proper brand/model with a well-defined temperature-controlled program.</li> <li>All the discussion provided must be related to the effect of temperature and duration used for calcination of RHA.</li> <li>It is recommended for the major revision before authors addressing all the comments that being raised up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Author's reservation is cleared by adding a paragraph showing the future recommendation for carrying out effect of using RHA on greenhouse gasses.</li> <li>The comment indicating use of cement in concrete as a benchmark to compare the Rice Husk Ash in concrete is not valid as this study is related only to the properties of Rice Husk Ash, and not RHA concrete. It is therefore added in the recommendation section to use RHA in concrete and perform the prescribed tests and then compare it with the normal concrete with pure cement.</li> <li>The brand and model of the furnace is not known however the test was performed in the presence of the head of "Pilot Plant" in Pakistan Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (PCSIR) laboratories Peshawar, Pakistan. The furnace is capped as shown in the figure, which keeps the temperature controlled in the given range of 600°C-800°C. All the changes made are highlighted in the main research document.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	