

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_111949
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Precast and Insitu Concrete and Their Effectiveness on Koga Irrigation Structures
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction effectively highlights the prevalence of conventional cast-in-situ concrete in Ethiopian construction projects and introduces the rationale for studying precast construction. It would be helpful to provide a bit more context on why irrigation lining concrete is specifically chosen for this analysis and its relevance in the Ethiopian construction landscape. Yes The main aim of the study is clearly stated, focusing on the analysis of irrigation lining concrete using visual inspection methods and non-destructive tests. Ensure that the objectives align with the aim and guide the reader on what to expect from the study. The proposed solutions, such as providing reinforcement bars for insitu canals and ensuring water-tight joints for precast concrete, are practical and align with the identified issues. Consider expanding on the feasibility and potential challenges associated with implementing these solutions in real-world construction scenarios. Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comparison of insitu and precast concrete linings in terms of strength, defects, and uniformity is insightful. Elaborate on the factors contributing to the observed lower strength in the in-situ lined canal and how these factors impact overall structural integrity. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language is clear and accessible, making the content easily understandable. Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., insitu vs. in-situ) for better readability. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Paresh Mirgal
Department, University & Country	Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India