



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_55997
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental and Analytical Investigations of Innovative Composite Materials using GFRP and Iron Slag for Railway Sleepers
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. In the introduction, the author talked about the limitations of conventional timber sleepers, and some studies have proposed various composite sleepers. However, it should also mention what flaws these existing composite sleepers have in order to highlight the advantages of the proposed composite sleepers by this present paper.</p> <p>2. Tables 1 and 4 are presented in the form of pictures. They and the rest of the tables should be changed to three-line tables.</p> <p>3. Mc and Mr and all other equations should be numbered, and they should be referenced in the text and not in the equation.</p> <p>4. The authors only presented the mixture M16 in Section 3, and poured it into the proposed composite sleeper. However, the results in Section 4 include sleeper 10 and sleeper 22. Therefore, they must state the number of specimens at the beginning of Section 2 and indicate which variables are considered by these specimens. Similarly, the difference between the two sleepers should be indicated in Section 3.</p> <p>5. the headings and text of Section 4 and Section 5 must be re-edited and merged into "4. Test results and discussions". According to the load-displacement response, cracking loads, ultimate bearing capacity, Young's modulus and stiffness, Section 4 should be divided, and where the corresponding test results and discussion should be given in text. Pay attention to the logic of expression.</p> <p>6. In Section 7, the authors should specifically point out the advantages and limitations of the proposed composite sleeper over other sleepers according to Table 4, and simply analyse the reasons.</p> <p>7. The format of the citation cannot exist in the heading of Section 8.</p>	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified and revised considering all the suggestions
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	