

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_123677</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Improving Tensile Strength Characteristics and Water absorption of Laterite Interlocking Blocks Enhanced with Different Burnt Sawdust Ash from Timber Species.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**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)
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.	This manuscript is important because it looks at a new way to use Burnt Sawdust Ash (BSDA) from different types of wood as a partial replacement for ordinary Portland cement (OPC) in making laterite interlocking blocks. The study shows that using waste from timber can improve the quality of building materials. This approach not only makes the blocks perform better but also helps the environment by cutting down the need for traditional cement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate, Can change to Enhancement of tensile strength and ...	
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 gives a clear overview of the study but could be improved by clearly stating the main research question or idea. It should also briefly summarize the key conclusion from the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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.	This goal fits well with today's focus on eco-friendly building materials. The research uses a careful method by testing different types of timber. The manuscript is scientifically solid because it follows a clear experiment plan, thorough testing, and provides detailed results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	references listed are diverse and cover various aspects related to the use of sawdust, laterite blocks, and alternative building materials. Some references, such as Elinwa & Mahmood (2002) and Adebakin et al. (2012), are relatively old. could provide some more recent studies from the last 5-10 years if available.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes its ok	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Add concise conclusion to summarize the main findings and their significance.	

**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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sadhu Charan Sahoo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Wood Science and Technology, India</b>