

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3834
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Calcite and Fly Ash for Manufacturing of Self Compacting Concrete
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This study explores the use of sustainable alternatives for conventional cement by utilizing calcite and fly ash for producing self compacting concrete. To investigate the fresh and hardened properties of self compacting concrete made with calcite and fly ash.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "Use of Calcite and Fly Ash for Manufacturing of Self-Compacting Concrete," is broad and does not effectively convey the specific contributions of the study. Author may explore different titles e.g. "Investigation of fresh and hardened properties of Self-Compacting Concrete Using Calcite and Fly Ash as Supplementary Cementitious Materials"	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract of the article provides a general overview of the study but lacks clarity and precision in presenting the key contributions and findings. Briefly mention the gap in knowledge this study addresses, such as the limited use of calcite and fly ash combinations in SCC. Include key findings, such as improvements in compressive strength, workability etc.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are reasonably appropriate for presenting the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. However, some adjustments could improve the clarity and flow: Introduction, materials and methods, experimental program, results and discussion, conclusion. These changes would make the manuscript more concise, reader-friendly.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The results and discussion section requires enhancement to provide a more thorough and insightful analysis of the findings. Provide a more detailed interpretation of quantitative results, such as specific trends in strength gain over time or correlations between workability and SCM content. If possible, incorporate microstructural analysis (e.g., SEM, XRD) to explain how the material composition influences the concrete's performance.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	The manuscript's references are limited and formatting is missing. To enhance the manuscript's relevance and credibility, it is advisable to incorporate more recent studies that reflect current advancements in the field.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It require improvements in clarity, grammar, and technical phrasing to meet the standards of high-quality academic writing. Comment: MAJOR REVISION required	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Major revision is required to improve the quality of manuscript for publication level, results and discussion section is extremely weak, need to improve a lot</b>	

[Review Form 2](#)

**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>Ramesh Gomasa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mahindra University, India</b>