



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_42835
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON THE FACTORIAL EFFECT OF CURING AGE ON SOME MAJOR PROPERTIES OF SANCRETE BLOCK PRODUCED IN THE WARM HUMID CLIMATE OF NIGERIA
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>)

**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	<p>1-The abstract is too long. A brief introduction of the research work and the most important results are the main context for the abstract part.</p> <p>2- The title of this manuscript is way too broad.</p> <p>3- Literature review should be enriched in the introductory part of the paper.</p> <p>4- Nomenclature list isn't given</p> <p>5- Sections should be given more comparison. The paper doesn't have the deep discussions</p> <p>6-The quality of some figures should be improved to rise the readability.</p> <p>7-The results presented by the authors are simple descriptions of figures but there is no interpretation and explanation to the observed results.</p> <p>8- More detailed interpretations of Figures-Tables depicting the outcome of closed-form solutions should be incorporate in this manuscript.</p> <p>9- The aim of the paper was not expressed clearly and the implications for research in this field should be detailed.</p> <p>9- Conclusions should be given under a separate title. In this section, a brief overview of the results and the important numerical results of the work should be given.</p> <p>10- The significance of this study is unclear</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript needs a thorough revision on its language and style.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Figen BALO</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Firat University, Turkey</i></b>