

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_92247
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF BIG SERVICE OPENINGS ON BENDING STRENGTH OF REINFORCED CONCRETE SLENDER BEAM
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Re-write the abstract; In abstract include briefly: Problem of study; Method of study; Parameters to be studied; Significant findings in (%) 2) Introduction: How to recognize the opening to be large or small? 3) Introduction: Deep beams are out of scope of this work 4) Introduction and literature review need to be combined as Introduction 5) Materials and method: Detailing and dimensions of the tested beams? 6) Refer to specifications adopted for testing. 7) Table showing coding of the specimens should be added. 8) what is about the history of loading (load-deflection curves) the cracking pattern at failure? add and discuss? 9) discuss the modes of failure of the tested specimens. 10) Table 2: As the beams are of the same mix, only three cubes are enough to measure comp. strength. What is about other ages? 11) Only yield stress and ultimate strengths are necessary. 12) The results of all beams should be indicated in one table delete tables 5&6. Non necessary columns should be removed. 13) estimated capacity: How to be calculated? 14) Summary and conclusions should be re-written as "conclusions" without repetition. 15) Recommendations: Delete this section 16) More comments are included in the reviewer attachment	
Minor REVISION comments	1) Fig.1: Quality of figures is not adequate 2) Table1 Why repeating cross-section and length? Delete the two columns. Check other tables 3) More comments are included in the reviewer attachment 4) Several repetitions should be deleted. 5) Manuscript may be submitted for proofreading.	
Optional/General comments	Non	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qasim M. Shakir
Department, University & Country	University of Kufa, Iraq