

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_117265
Title of the Manuscript:	Anchorage Bond Strength of Glass Fibre Polymer Reinforced Concrete with Palm Kernel Shells as Partial Coarse Aggregate
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The study focused on determining the anchorage bond strength of Glass Fibre Polymer reinforced concrete with PKS as partial coarse aggregate. Normal weight concrete mix ratio of 1:1.5:3 with water-cement ratio (w/c) of 0.5 and lightweight concrete with 10% of the volume of coarse aggregate replaced by PKS were used in double pull-out prismatic specimens of dimension 100mm x 100mm x 300mm for control and test specimens respectively, embedded with 12mm and 16mm diameter GFRP reinforcing bars at varying embedment lengths. However, before it can be considered for publication, please address the following comments for a revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The problem to be addressed in this study should also be highlighted in the Abstract. 2) The authors should also present some quantitative results in the Abstract. 3) The authors are recommended to add latest relevant literature review on such works. 4) What is the need for this work? Is this work helpful for practical applications? Which applications? 5) The literature review should be improved by adding latest references and discussion. 6) Work methodologies need more discussion. 7) Results section should be defended using technical reasons and relevant references. 8) There are no critical review/discussions before the Conclusions. Authors should add it. 9) Conclusions should be refined and briefly presented (not like a lab report). More numerical results should be added. 10) What are the limitations of the present study? Please mention them in the manuscript. 11) Graphs can be improved. 	

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:	Ali Raza
Department, University & Country	UET Taxila, Pakistan