



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_29007
Title of the Manuscript:	Flexural Behavior of Steel–Concrete–Steel Sandwich Slabs
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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:

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



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>A. Author needs to re-write the abstract in such a way that the following elements of abstract will flow together</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. aims 2. methodology 3. results 4. finding(s) 5. conclusion(s) <p>These may be in different paragraphs. The way it was written in the abstract is not acceptable. There is no need for: Aims:</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lines 16 – 18: “This is found in engineering structures such as ships, train stations and high towers”. Author should recast this sentence. 2. Line 32: the title for Fig. 1 is too long. This can be split into two for Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b to have their respective titles. 3. Author should include literature on previous work covering this area of research (if any). 4. Line 123: “For moderately moist sand and gravel (the usual condition) is used,”. The statement should have be written in past sentence as “For moderately moist sand and gravel (the usual condition) was used,” 5. Line 127: ampersand “&” should be replaced with “and”. 6. Lines 128 – 129: unit N/mm2 should be N/mm² 7. Lines 128 -129: “And splitting tensile strength form 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>.....” should have been written as “Splitting tensile strength from cylinders tests</p> <p>8. Lines 142 -143: “.... 100 ton capacity....” should have written as “.....100 tons capacity.....” or “.....100-ton capacity.....”</p> <p>9. Line 202: the title for Fig. 6 is too long. This can be split into two for Fig. 6a and Fig. 6b to have their respective titles.</p> <p>10. Lines 503 – 524: Remove the numbering of paragraphs in the conclusions</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adeyefa Oludele Adebayo
Department, University & Country	Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Ibadan, Nigeria