TECHNICAL PAPER REVIEW FORM

PAPER AND AUTHOR DETAILS

Paper Identification: ACMSM23-189 (Review A)

Paper Title: GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE WITH FRP CONFINEMENT

Name(s) of Author(s): Kurt LEMBO, Weena LOKUGE and Warna KARUNASENA

NOTES TO REVIEWER AND REVIEWER FAMILIARITY WITH SUBJECT

- Part A: provide recommendations on the publishability and award quality of the paper followed by comments (if any) to the authors. Comments are to be constructive and to help ensure the conference proceedings contain high quality papers.
- Part B: reviewer to endorse this form and provide confidential comments (if any) to the Chair of the ACMSM23 2014 Organising Committee (i.e. Conference Chair).

Reviewer familiarity with the subject matter of this paper (*please delete the unwanted responses*)	High

(If the reviewer is not sufficiently familiar with the paper subject matter in order conduct a meaningful review, then they should immediately contact the Conference Chair at acmsm23@scu.edu.au)

PART A: REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (*please place "X' next to only one of the following boxes*)

Accept	**Revise** [#]	**Reject**
No Change: □	Minor Revisions: **X**	Not Publishable: □
Optional Revisions: □	Major Revisions: □	

[#] In the case of minor or major revisions, the revised manuscript will be re-reviewed by a member of the Organising Committee unless the reviewer specifically requests otherwise.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS (*please delete the unwanted response(s)*)

1. Title (is the paper title appropriate?)	Yes
2. Originality (has a substantial component of paper been published elsewhere?)	No.
3. Formatting (paper has been formatted in accordance with the conference guidelines)	Yes
4. Grammar (is the level of English satisfactory for publication in the proceedings?)	Yes
5. Technical/professional merit of paper (1=poor, 5=excellent)	3
6. Contribution to field (1=poor, 5=excellent)	3
7. Organisation/clarity of paper (1=poor, 5=excellent)	3
8. Overall rating of paper (1=poor, 5=excellent) (*rank 5 = **Best Paper Award** quality*)	3,

[This page will be sent to the author(s)]

[This section will be sent to the author(s)]

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

Please insert your comments to the author(s) here (written feedback may, for example, address strengths, weaknesses, omissions, technical and typographical errors, and inconsistencies of the paper):

Page 2: It is not true to say inorganic polymer concrete has very little shrinkage.

In Fig.3. Why is the scatter so large in cases of small samples? Why did more layers of GFRP sheets lead to lower compressive strength?

In Fig.4, it seems that the stiffness of FRP confinement had marginal effects on the compressive strength and ductility. Why? Please present the results of unconfined concrete as well for comparison purposes.

The stress-strain curves of FRP-confined geopolymer concrete are very strange in Fig.4. They supposed to be exhibit a bilinear manner. Was the deformation measurement correct?

Page 5: the following statement is wrong. The stiffness of FRP confinement rather than the type of FRP plays a more important role.

.

"Furthermore it was found that greater ductility benefits were associated with GFRP, which is consistent with the GFRP confined OPC concrete. "