

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127727
Title of the Manuscript:	Research status of steel-concrete joint section of cable-stayed bridge
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

General guidelines for the 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 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	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The authors try to provide a useful view about the steel-concrete joint section of cable-stayed bridge ignoring recent novelties on this topic. To be covered this gap, the authors should provide figures and diagrams in the article, giving detailed information about the superiority of this type of structures against on traditional materials, i.e. steel and concrete.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article should change. The alternative title is: Review on composite (steel/concrete) joint sections of cable-stayed bridge.	
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 of the article is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The most references are recent. However, the authors should express more recent articles.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language should be re-structured because there are enough expressive mistakes in the article.	
Optional/General comments	1) The authors did not include figures, diagrams or/and expressions in their article. 2) The authors should add the references and the new ones in the article.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dionisios Serras
Department, University & Country	University of Thessaly, Greece