



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_43628
Title of the Manuscript:	Recycling and exploitation of Construction and Demolition Wastes as additives in unsaturated polyester composite building and insulation materials; Mechanical and thermal properties Investigation
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	Some of the results are interesting but a good deal of editing is required to bring the manuscript up to an acceptable minimum standard. I recommend this manuscript to accepted with Minor revision.	Required editing corrections were made as appropriate following authors guidelines
Minor REVISION comments	1. Abstract is not clear. Please show the result of the research in the abstract. 2. Too many typing error in manuscript, include references. Please consider to check one by one. Please see the template. 3. The introduction is poor. Needs to be more specific and explaining the novelty of the paper. The sentences and the main ideas are mixed. 4. The results are poor written and does not follow the scientific standards.	1. <u>Abstract</u> was re-written. Results of research have been concisely presented (<i>«In particular...strength», lines 9-18 of abstract section</i>), (<i>«Thermo-insulating...applications», lines 19-23 of abstract section</i>). <i>The final conclusion of research has been clearly presented («In conclusion....applications», lines 24-26, of abstract section).</i> 2. <u>Typing errors</u> in the text and references were spotted and corrected according to reviewer's commenting and in respect to author guidelines template. 3. <u>Introduction</u> was re-written according to commenting recommendations. Novelty of paper was presented (<i>«According...introduced», lines 39-50 of manuscript</i>). 4. <u>Results</u> discussion was enriched and reformed according to reviewer's recommendations. Brief description of what is presented in the diagrams is added in explanation of graphical representations (<i>«pure polyester.....respectively», lines 122-124 of manuscript</i>) and (<i>«As....columns», lines146-149 of manuscript</i>). The optimal performing loading scenario has been outlined (<i>«Optimum...studied», lines139-141</i>), (<i>«An enhancement.....examined», lines156-158</i>), Thermal analysis results were appropriately analysed and presented (<i>«Analytically...mechanical strength», lines176-185</i>) accompanied by the appropriate referencing. Typing errors in Table 1 were spotted and corrected (column 3: CDW (%w/w 30% changed to 40%). Results have been also concisely presented according and template demands in the conclusion (<i>«Polyester...applications», lines 192-199 of manuscript</i>).
Optional/General comments		