



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	➤ Abstract needs to be slightly revised or re-written. A single paragraph is all that is needed. The abstract should not be broken down into separate segments as in the original manuscript.	➤ The abstract has now been revised. The previous abstract was packaged in the format of the journal.
Minor REVISION comments	➤ The reference to Olutoge [7] in the Introduction should be moved to preferably the 1st or 2nd paragraph of the Introduction. Leaving it at the present location in the original manuscript is slightly inappropriate, since Olutoge's work [7] dealt with saw dust and palm kernel shells, and not iron fillings or similar material as such. ➤ The physical properties of iron fillings shown in Table 2 do not indicate whether these values are BS 812-2 recommendations or whether they are the author(s) findings. If the latter, the Author(s) should give some indication in the text how these values were arrived at. ➤ BS 812-2 is referred to in Table 2 and referenced as [11]. However in the References, BS 812-1 is Reference [11]. The Author(s) should clear up this anomaly. ➤ In Table 3, the chemical composition of iron fillings appear to be taken from the work of Mamza et al [12]. Was the chemical composition of the iron fillings used by the Author(s) same as that of Mamza et al [12]. Were the iron fillings from the same basic source?	➤ The reference to Olutoge [7] has been removed from the manuscript. ➤ The physical properties of iron fillings shown in Table 2 were obtained by following the procedure specified in BS 812-2. ➤ It was a typographical error. However, the correction has been effected. It is BS 812-2 ➤ The iron fillings were not from the same basic source. However, that is a typical chemical composition of iron fillings in Nigeria that is why Mamza et al was referenced.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	➤ It would be nice to insert a photograph or figure in the text showing a sample or a batch of the iron fillings used in the present study.	➤ The photograph of a sample of the iron filings used for the present study has been inserted in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	❖ In general, the manuscript is well written and the grammar is quite satisfactory.	Thanks for your comments!