

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_121778
Title of the Manuscript:	Flexural Strength and Deformations Capacity of Structural Beams Reinforced with Steel Bars Milled from Recycled Metals in Ghana.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the performance of structural beams reinforced with locally manufactured steel bars from recycled metals in Ghana. It offers useful data relevant to sustainable construction practices in the region.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It accurately reflects the content and focus of the study.	
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 is comprehensive but could be improved for clarity and conciseness. It effectively summarizes the study's objectives and findings but could benefit from a more focused presentation of key results and their implications. Consider condensing some of the details and emphasizing the significance of the findings to make the abstract more impactful. Additionally, reducing redundancy in the presentation of experimental results would enhance readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript need improvement. While the manuscript is organized logically, the Materials and Methods section and Theoretical Analysis section require more detail to enhance clarity and comprehension. Additionally, the Introduction, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion sections would benefit from restructuring to better present the study's findings and contributions.	
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.	While the manuscript demonstrates a solid experimental approach, it lacks critical details such as the concrete grade, which impacts scientific rigor. The Materials and Methods and Theoretical Analysis sections require improvement for better clarity. Although the experimental effort is commendable, the manuscript's scientific robustness is undermined by inadequate drafting, insufficient justification of results, and numerous grammatical errors. Enhancing these areas would significantly improve the manuscript's technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references in the manuscript are not sufficient and lack recent studies on the flexural behavior of beams. Additionally, there are issues with formatting, such as missing DOIs. It is recommended to include more recent and relevant literature to strengthen the manuscript's foundation. Proper formatting of references is also necessary to meet academic standards.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is below the standard required for scholarly communication. There are numerous grammatical errors and issues with clarity throughout the text. A thorough proofreading and editing process is necessary to enhance readability and ensure the manuscript meets academic standards.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Observations:</p> <p>Concrete Grade Information:</p> <p>The manuscript does not specify the grade of concrete used in the experiments. Including this information is essential for understanding the context and relevance of the results.</p> <p>Materials and Methods, and Theoretical Analysis Sections:</p> <p>Both sections need improvement. The Materials and Methods section should provide more detailed descriptions of the experimental setup and procedures. The Theoretical Analysis section should be expanded to offer a clearer explanation of the analytical framework.</p> <p>Drafting of Experimental Work:</p> <p>While the experimental work is commendable, the presentation of the results could be better organized and articulated. Enhanced drafting will improve the clarity and impact of the findings.</p> <p>Beam Testing Observations and Graphs:</p> <p>The observations and graphs are well-presented, but the justification and interpretation of the results need further development. A more detailed discussion on how the results support the conclusions would strengthen the manuscript.</p> <p>Grammatical Errors:</p> <p>There are numerous grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading is necessary to enhance readability and overall quality.</p> <p>Sections Rewriting:</p> <p>The Introduction, Results and Discussion, and Conclusions sections require rewriting. These sections should be more cohesive, clearly stating the study's contributions and implications.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>The reference list is inadequate, with many relevant articles on flexural behavior of beams missing. Additionally, references need proper formatting, including DOI numbers where applicable.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	C. Prithiviraj
Department, University & Country	Jei Mathaajee College of Engineering, Anna University, India