



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_67189
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the performance of concrete mixed with different water sources within small scale mining catchment areas in Ghana
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstract should be rewritten and should include: Problem statement – objectives- methodology – significant results and recommendations.</li> <li>• There should be some improvements in the language. Please refer to the corrections given on the manuscript through “track changes”.</li> <li>• There should be at least one or two sentences in between the section numbers / clause numbers. Example: Between 2 and 2.1 &amp; 2.1 and 2.1.1. Between 2.3 and 2.3.1. Between 3 and 3.1.</li> <li>• Section 2: Font style and font sizes are not in uniform.</li> <li>• Section 2.2 says totally 84 cubes cast but Table 1 says totally 87 cubes (36+48+3), this need to be checked.</li> <li>• What is the reason for testing cubes at 180 days for SEM analysis? What about 28 days?</li> <li>• Size of prism used for flexural strength 100×100×300 mm is correct? Since most of the standards says the size of prism to be used for flexural strength is 100×100×500 mm. If it is 100×100×300 mm used then what was the support bearing length?</li> <li>• What type of loading was applied to conduct flexural strength test? Central point load or two point loads?</li> <li>• Section 2.2.1: and Section 4: Justify alignment is missing.</li> <li>• Section 2.3.2: Procedure given for slump cone test is unnecessary (it is a traditional one and giving standard itself enough) and hence to be removed.</li> <li>• Section 2.3.3 and 2.3.4: Rate of loading must be indicated.</li> <li>• Section 3.5.3: What is LCS? Where is the citations statement for Eq.1?</li> <li>• Figure 6 doesn't find any caption?</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction:</b> Second, third and fourth paragraph – Many sentences are written by stating “activities of illegal”, “Galamsey” by the authors including the literature studies [7-16]. Especially on “This study therefore focuses on the effect of water from the various water sources in the illegal small scale mining catchment areas on the quality of concrete”.</p> <p>From my perception, the above mentioned may be considered as ethical issues in general. However, if the nativity of the authors and the publishers does not have any issues on this then me don't mind it.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please note that the Figures given in the file are not opening for review except Figure 5.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>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>K. Gunasekaran</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India</i></b>