



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_29938
Title of the Manuscript:	Strength Properties of Concrete Produced With Iron Filings as Sand Replacement
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Be specified in the conclusion than that you wright, please modify the figures to be curves or straight lines whatever, it will be more clear to improve the idea of the research, please put in the paper the effect of durability and the effect of the filing on RC and reinforcement.	➤ We specified an optimum of 10% or 20% replacement of sand (by weight) with iron filings depending on the desirable strength properties the concrete to be produced. In a case where only the compressive strength is required, 20% should be the optimum. Whereas, 10% should be the optimum when split-tensile and flexural strengths respectively required. However, 20% is the general optimum. ➤ The scope of our study was limited to plain concrete. We did not carry out any study on reinforced concrete in this present investigation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		