

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_84333
Title of the Manuscript:	Nonlinear finite element analysis for Concrete Deep Beam Reinforced with GFRP Bars
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In abstract, author must be mentioned the objectives of study, methodology, results, and recommendations. Done2. In fact, I do not see any results in abstract. Therefore, abstract must rewrite. Done3. To make the reading easy, introduction can be as separated paragraphs. Done4. The researcher used just one specimen? But in table 1, he mentioned 5 specimens? B1 to B5!!!!!!!! Done5. Figure 5 shows that specimen 8? But table 1 has just 5 specimens!!!!!! Done6. He must add all crack pattern figures for all specimens, B1 to B5. Done7. He must explain the differences between specimens. Done8. In Ansys, he must explain five specimens. Done9. Conclusions to short and weak. It must be improved. Done10. References are not enough. Done11. The presentation of paper needs to improve. Done	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract has been rewritten to clarify the study's objectives, methods, results, and recommendations provided.2. .All experimental and analytical test results, as well as the result of the comparison between them, were clarified and described, as was the result of the comparison between the analytical data and the predicted values using the ACI code provision.3. For easier reading, the introduction has been rewritten as a series of discrete paragraphs.4. This study includes one specimen that was experimentally tested and reinforced with GFRP bars, in addition to five specimens that were analytically tested using the ANSYS software, namely B1, B2, B3, B4 and B5.5. The label of the experimental specimen has been changed from B8 to B, and this has been noted.6. The crack pattern for all analytically tested beams was added7. The research revealed the differences between the specimens, revealing that one deep beam was experimentally examined and five others were tested analytically, but all were reinforced with GFRP bars.8. The difference between the analytically tested specimens was clarified by adding the crack pattern to all these specimens9. The conclusion has been modified to include all research results.10. This study was supported, and the number of references was raised.11. The research was formatted and extracted with care, and it was presented in a professional manner.
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	