



raja t <rajasd28@gmail.com>

Reviewer Notification of Editor Decision

1 message

Sylvie ROSSIGNOL <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>
Reply-To: Sylvie ROSSIGNOL <sylvie.rossignol@unilim.fr>
To: rajasd28@gmail.com

Sun, Jun 16, 2019 at 11:05 PM

Ref: CONBUILDMAT-D-19-03817

Title: High-temperature tensile properties of hybrid fiber-reinforced strain hardening cementitious composite

Article Type: Research Paper

Dear Mr. raja t,

Thank you once again for reviewing the above-referenced paper. With your help the following final decision has now been reached:

Reject After Review

The author decision letter and reviewer reports can be found below.

We appreciate your time and effort in reviewing this paper and greatly value your assistance as a reviewer for Construction & Building Materials.

If you have not yet activated or completed your 30 days of access to Scopus and ScienceDirect, you can still access them via this link:

http://scopees.elsevier.com/ees_login.asp?journalacronym=CONBUILDMAT&username=rajasd28@gmail.com

You can use your EES password to access Scopus and ScienceDirect via the URL above. You can save your 30 days access period, but access will expire 6 months after you accepted to review.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvie ROSSIGNOL
Editor
Construction & Building Materials

To: "Jingming Cai" jingming.cai@kuleuven.be
cc: ;569951268@qq.com; zswang@dufe.edu.cn; zhangcong@jiangnan.edu.cn
From: Sylvie ROSSIGNOL eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com
Reply To: Sylvie ROSSIGNOL sylvie.rossignol@unilim.fr
Subject: Your Submission
Ms. Ref. No.: CONBUILDMAT-D-19-03817
Title: High-temperature tensile properties of hybrid fiber-reinforced strain hardening cementitious composite
Construction & Building Materials

Dear Dr. Jingming Cai,

Reviewers' comments on your work have now been received. You will see that they are advising against publication of your work. Therefore I must reject it.

For your guidance, I append the reviewers' comments below.
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Sylvie ROSSIGNOL
Editor
Construction & Building Materials

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2: This submission looks like a research report rather than a scientific manuscript. This work is not acceptable for publication in Construction and Building Materials. The main reasons for the rejection are following:

- (1) Absence of scientific background of the research is the fundamental drawback of this manuscript. Several fiber reinforced concretes were tested after exposition under different temperature conditions. Neither the mix design principles nor the choice of the temperature regime was substantiated. What was the research idea/purpose?
- (2) The research lacks novelty. A low resistance of PVA fiber to high temperature is well documented fact. It is related to the low melt temperature (approximately equal to 250 °C), whereas a substantial degradation of material properties become evident at temperatures exceeding 150 °C. (The authors have correctly described that fact in Introduction). Thus, majority of the observed results were evident without any tests. It is, therefore, unclear how this work will contribute to the current state of the knowledge.
- (3) Practical value of this study is low. That is a consequence of the aforementioned drawbacks.
- (4) Other comments. Highlights are missing. Geometry parameters of the specimens were not specified; type of the specimens is unclear ("dog-bone" shaped specimens are mentioned in the text, but cubes are shown in Figure 2); the term "crack deflection" is not common, etc. Misleading descriptions and erroneous statements are found in the text. Since this drawback is not the governing criteria of the negative evaluation of the manuscript, list of these errors is not included in this report.

Reviewer #3: The language in the manuscript is not good with numerous grammatical and sentence composition errors making it difficult to understand. Introduction is extremely short - it mentions a lot of studies but there is no detailed discussion of previous findings. The authors must identify the knowledge gaps after thoroughly reviewing the existing literature. The motivation and objectives of the research should be clearly identified. The performance of hybrid fiber reinforced SHCC (with PVA and steel fibers) has been comprehensively investigated in other studies and there is no new knowledge generated in this study.

Besides the above, the naming of figures and presentation of results could be improved significantly.

Reviewer #4: The present paper reports a study on the tensile behaviour of hybrid cementitious composite material at elevated temperatures.

The authors used cement: fly ash : sand in the ratio of 1:4:1.18 with a water binder ratio of 0.34 along with superplasticisers to improve the workability.

The mix looks like a high volume fly ash mix. Is it Class C or Class F Fly ash used in the mix. What is the purpose of making a high volume fly ash mix??

Also property enhancement based on the exterior color changes are not much appreciated.

Please find the annotated paper for more details

=====

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EES via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

=====

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EES via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of

4/15/2021

Gmail - Reviewer Notification of Editor Decision

our customer support representatives.