

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123811
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of Loading Eccentricity on Strength of Reinforced Concrete Square Pad Footings</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of civil engineering—the impact of eccentric loading on reinforced concrete pad footings. Understanding this phenomenon is vital for structural safety and optimization in building construction. The study provides experimental data that can be used by engineers to predict the performance of footings under misalignment conditions, which is crucial for both design and construction phases. Overall, this research contributes valuable insights that can lead to more resilient and efficient construction practices.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title, "Experimental Analysis of Load Carrying Capacity of Reinforced Concrete Pad Footings under Varying Eccentricities," is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, an alternative title could be "Impact of Eccentric Loading on the Structural Performance of Reinforced Concrete Pad Footings: An Experimental Study" to emphasize the study's focus on eccentric loading conditions.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from a clearer statement on the practical implications of the findings. It would be helpful to briefly mention how these results could influence design guidelines or construction practices. Additionally, a more concise summary of the methodology (e.g., the setup used in the experiments) could provide better context for the results and conclusions presented.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and follows a logical sequence: introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, the "Methodology" section could be further divided into subsections to improve readability, such as separating "Experimental Setup," "Materials Used," and "Testing Procedures."</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The authors have employed a well-established experimental approach to investigate a practical engineering problem, providing valuable data and interpretations. The study's methodology is detailed, allowing for reproducibility, and the results are presented in a clear and logical manner. The discussion effectively connects the findings to the broader context of structural engineering and construction safety, reinforcing the manuscript's scientific merit.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant. However, including more recent studies from the past five years on eccentric loading and reinforced concrete footings could strengthen the literature review section. Adding references related to advancements in numerical modeling of footing behavior under eccentric loads could also provide a more comprehensive background.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical improvements and better clarity in some sections, particularly in the "Results" and "Discussion," would enhance the manuscript's readability and impact. Proofreading for consistency in terminology and style is also recommended.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The study addresses an important gap in understanding the impact of eccentric loading on reinforced concrete footings, which has significant practical implications for structural engineering. While the experimental approach is solid, the inclusion of a comparative analysis with numerical modeling results or field data could further strengthen the manuscript. Future studies may consider exploring different soil types or more varied eccentricity conditions to broaden the applicability of the findings</p> <p>There are no ethical issues identified in this manuscript. The study is experimental and does not involve human or animal subjects, nor does it include any sensitive data that requires ethical consideration. The research appears to adhere to standard scientific ethical guidelines, and all necessary precautions for experimental integrity seem to have been taken.</p> <p>There are no competing interest issues disclosed in the manuscript. The authors have not mentioned any conflicts of interest that would affect the integrity of their findings. It would be good practice for the authors to explicitly state in the manuscript that there are no competing interests.</p> <p>There is no evidence of plagiarism detected in this manuscript. The content appears original, and the references are appropriately cited. The similarity of the work to existing literature is in line with standard academic research, where new studies build upon previous findings</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Malik Hussain Muzaffar Awan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pakistan</b>