SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_48362
Title of the Manuscript:	BEHAVIOUR OF DAMAGED B.F.I. BEAM REPAIRED BY CFRP STRIPS UNDER STATIC OR FATIGUE LOADS USING FINITE ELEMENT SIMULATION
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	Abstract- Write full form of B.F.I. beam Abstract- Do not write references in abstract Abstract- replace analytical results as FE results because paper compares Expt and FE results. Secn.2. As presented in our previous study write reference Secn. 2 fig and table write as Fig. and Table, check style of writing figures and table in the paper, it is different in various places. Secn.2 Materials properties of B.F.I. steel beams, CFRP strips, etc written in this section need to be supported by references Secn.3. write version & reference to ANSYS used in the analysis Fig.2. what is the reason to take elastic-perfect plastic model to the beam, why it is linear for CFRP? Fig.5 FE results are in close agreement with the expt results by considering elastic-perfectly plastic model for the beam, but in reality, the material property of beam is elastic-plastic with some strain hardening value can you justify this	
Minor REVISION comments	Load unit is written as KN throughout the paper, write as kN There are mistakes in writing, authors need to check the paper for error free.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is basically a FE validation work for the experimental results of reference [1]. Good work But, the paper lacks the analysis of the results and justification of the material models used in the FEA.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shashidhar K. Kudari
Department, University & Country	CVR College of Engineering, JNT University, India

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)