

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofAdvancedResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJARR_122194
TitleoftheManuscript:	StrengthandDeformation:StructuralCharacteristicsofConcreteBeamsReinforcedwithGFRPBars
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

ReviewForm3

PART1:ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article presents: 1. An exploration of the behavior of concrete beams reinforced with GFRP bars, providing essential data for subsequent numerical studies. 2. A comparison between the use of GFRP and steel bars, focusing on critical load, central displacement, and strain distribution. 3. Results that highlight the flexural performance of concrete beams reinforced with GFRP bars.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Concrete Beams Reinforced with GFRP Bars: Analyzing Strength and Deformation Properties".	
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.	In the abstract, the authors introduce the abbreviation "RC" without defining its meaning. It is recommended that the full term be written out initially, followed by the abbreviation "RC" in parentheses for subsequent use.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Section 2 could be reorganized.	
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.	1. The article presents the mechanical properties necessary for in-depth numerical studies on GFRP beams. 2. The analysis of flexural beams, through both experimental and theoretical studies, underscores a significant contribution by addressing two important fields. 3. The study highlights several key advantages of using GFRP bars, demonstrating structures with higher load capacities and increased ductility.	
Are there references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Taerwe, L. Non-metallic (FRP) reinforcement for concrete structures: proceedings of the second international RILEM symposium. CRC Press, 2004. This book compiles studies on beams reinforced with various materials under flexural analysis, providing a comparative assessment between GFRP and other materials.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Suggestion at adjustment of the text according to the comments inserted in the review file, where: 1. The clarity of certain terms needs improvement. 2. The organization of the information presentation requires attention. 3. The standardization of nomenclature was necessary. Suggestion to contribution of study: 1. A ductility study will contribute to the analysis of the study.	

ReviewForm3

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:	Guilherme Santos da Silveira
Department, University & Country	Federal Technological University of Paraná, Brazil