

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_144516
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Resistance of Pavement slabs reinforced with polyethylene terephthalate (PET) mesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author’s Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is interesting because it utilizes PET as a reinforcement in aggregate. This research prioritizes recycling as a renewable material and also reduces the use of metal or similar materials as reinforcement in aggregate mixtures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is sufficient; it is recommended to omit the impact testing equipment to further engage readers. For example, the title is "Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Mesh-Reinforced Composites for Road Pavement." This ensures the manuscript doesn't appear simplistic..	
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.	The abstract doesn't need to provide detailed dimensions; what's needed is a comparison between the aggregate mixture (composite) before and after PET mesh installation.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is highly scientific, utilizing PET waste as mesh for road paving. Unfortunately, not many tests are presented, such as water absorption or SEM fracture..	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References should be dated at least 2020, or five years ago. References from 2012, 1999, and 2016 are certainly far behind technological developments. Therefore, references should be replaced with newer ones.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is understandable, although it needs to be refined.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is quite interesting, but the writing technique is not thorough, references are inaccurate, citations are inconsistent, material acquisition and mixing processes are not explained in detail, and tables are still rudimentary. Therefore, it needs major revision (Major revision) to be accepted.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
--	---------------------------	--

Review Form 3

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>There are no ethical issues in writing this manuscript. Clean, pure technological development.</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	There are no issues of interest in this manuscript. There are no competing interests in this manuscript.	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	There is no issue of plagiarism in the writing of this manuscript.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	Major revision is required for the manuscript to be accepted by the journal.

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Sakuri Sakuri
Department of Reviewer	Mechanical Engineering (Composite)
University or Institution of Reviewer	Wiworotomo university of Purwokerto Indonesia
Country of Reviewer	Purwokerto central jawa Indonesia
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Profesor
Email ID of Reviewer	Sakuridahlan33@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+0628122935266
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Mechanical engineering, composite, materials.