

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_129621
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamic Analysis of an Exponentially Decaying Foundation on the Response of Non-Uniform Damped Rayleigh Beam under Harmonic Moving Load with General Boundary Conditions
Type of the 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is devoted to methods for assessing the stress-strain state of building structures. In particular, beams on an elastic base under dynamic loads. The article is of undoubted importance for the scientific community in applied mechanics, since the issues of assessing strength and stress-strain state have been and will remain extremely important for the mechanical safety of structures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, the title is too long. Variant name: "Dynamic analysis of an non-uniform damped Rayleigh beam on a harmonic moving load with general boundary conditions"	
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 correct, I have no comments.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and sufficient	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Formula 1. The lowercase letter r is used to indicate the moment of inertia, the capital letter is used below the text.2. In section 5, it is recommended to change the design. Place the description of the graphs closer to the figures for a more comfortable analysis of the results.3. How significant are the computational errors when comparing the results of your calculations with classical FEM calculations based on similar calculation schemes?	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Semenov Daniil
Department, University & Country	Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic, University