

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 highlights the use of recycled PET mesh to enhance the impact resistance of concrete pavement slabs, offering a sustainable alternative for construction. It presents a practical method for reusing plastic waste, addressing environmental concerns in developing countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is. It accurately reflects the core focus of the study: testing the impact resistance of pavement slabs using PET mesh as reinforcement.	
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.	Should be revised: “Mesh spacing of 25mm c/c recorded the highest impact resistance that was about 400% and 424% respectively of the 24 N/mm² and 35N/mm² plain concrete (control).” is confusing and overly detailed for an abstract. It can be shortened and clarified.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is. The manuscript is scientifically valid and well-designed experimental methodology. However, some minor considerations such as trends are reported clearly, no mention of standard deviation, confidence intervals, or statistical testing is made.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are from before 2017, with the most recent being from Shafferina et al. (2017). While the foundational studies are important and appropriate, adding more recent literature (2018–2024) would enhance the academic depth and show awareness of ongoing developments in this field.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language requires moderate editing to improve clarity, sentence structure, and academic writing. Authors should revise the manuscript for grammar, conciseness, and consistency of the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Minor revisions is English language, including of recent references.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> There are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	There are no apparent competing interest issues in this manuscript.	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	There is no indication of plagiarism in the 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”

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) Guideline: 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)	7.5

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	Asst. Prof. Thipsuree Kornboonraksa, Ph.D.
Department of Reviewer	Department of Chemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
University or Institution of Reviewer	Burapha University
Country of Reviewer	Thailand
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Assistant Professor
Email ID of Reviewer	thipsuree@eng.buu.ac.th
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	-
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Environmental Management, Environmental Monitoring, Wastewater Treatment, Membrane Technology, Solid Waste Management