

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_99745
Title of the Manuscript:	Summary of Research on Shear Strength of Keyed Joints in Segmental Precast Assembled Bridge
Type of the Article	Minireview 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		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 	<p>Not really. Rather, it is part of a scientific article that should be titled "Literature Review".</p> <p>Like above.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>It is rather a part of the scientific article.</p> <p>Yes, I do.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, it is. BTW: " This paper expounds on the research results of..." (?)	
Optional/General comments	There are no figures. It could even be an interesting article, but with pictures showing the differences and effects, advantages and disadvantages, and with the author's proposal to solve or improve the problems.	

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:	Krzysztof Murawski
Department, University & Country	Poland