

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_83442
Title of the Manuscript:	Combined Effect of Marble Dust and Waste Paper Sludge in Improving Engineering Properties of Black-cotton Soil of Gelan Area, Ethiopia
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

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	Abstract – please explain the WPS is used for adding or replacing. Introduction – please put the citation which the statement or word gets from any reference such as ‘they are rich in montmorillonite....’ and ‘shrinkage during the dry season.....’ Literature – please add more previous studies on the black-cotton soil and how they improved it and which material they used. Please standardize the unit that is used after numbering or data such as 60% or 60 % and 6mm or 6 mm (just select a suitable one). Please check the format for the citation/reference in the sentences. Second paragraph – Elias? Materials and methods – Explain why took two locations of black-cotton soil? The chemical composition is another subheading or not? My suggestion makes it into another subheading or put into part of the methods. Please ensure all testing in methods must be reported in results and discussion such as in Table 2, etc. Result and Discussion – All table is not explained well in paragraph and sentences such as percentage difference, the difference between test pit 1 and test pit 2, why get the data like that and proven by the previous study. Explain the words ‘The gel then crystallizes to form an interlocking structure’ because not clear. Conclusion – please rewrite, please refer to objectives, please put some data/percentage/range of the result and discussion, and please explain accordingly to the arrangement of the result and discussion. References – add more and use the latest reference (2017-2022)	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	An interesting research area but a lot of modification and changes must be done. Please use short-term for waste paper sludge (WPS). For other comments please refer to the article. Please update and upgrade the grammar of the paper.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohd Syahrul Hisyam bin Mohd Sani
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan, Malaysia