

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2517
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical study of the vibrations of beams with variable stiffness under impulsive or harmonic loading
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study of Beam's is important since it has a strong role in the Engineering, Real estate, Transportation, Automobile, and Industrial sectors. To make a safe structure, car, factory, Bridge, ship, plane, etc., we need to study the behaviour of different beams under various loading and support conditions. In my opinion, the scientific community will like this manuscript because the study was done using widely accepted numerical method and the findings were compared with analytical results which increases the soundness of the technical aspect of the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article's title is suitable since it precisely presents the study's objective.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article could have been more comprehensive.  I would suggest the following write-up for the abstract to make it more comprehensive:  In this study, the Successive Approximation Method (SAM), is employed for the numerical analysis of vibrations of beams with variable stiffness under impulse or harmonic loading. Using the SAM some integration algorithm is established and applied to examples of beams with variable stiffness, under variable loading, and the different cases of supports chosen in the literature. We have thus calculated the cases of beams with constant or variable rigidity with articulated or embedded supports, subjected to the action of an instantaneous impulse and harmonic loads distributed over its entire length. To justify the robustness of the SAM considered in this work, an example of an articulated beam with variable stiffness subjected to a distributed harmonic load was calculated analytically, and the results obtained compared to those found numerically for various steps (spatial $h$ and temporal $\bar{\tau}$ ) of calculus, and the difference between the values obtained by the two methods was small. For example for ( $h = 1/8, \bar{\tau} = 1/64$ ), the difference between these values is 17%.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, good enough.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is technically sound since it has compared numerical findings with analytical results. The manuscript has a good literature review with enough references. The manuscript demonstrates the importance of the study and the study was based on a proven and widely accepted numerical method. In conclusion, the manuscript is scientifically robust since it has applied the SAM method.	

[Review Form 2](#)

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes, the references used are sufficient.</b>	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of this article is below par. There are lots of areas and sentences which can be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need to remove grammar, punctuation errors and wording mistakes. Figures, graphs and tables have scope for improvement so that readers understand easily.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Raqib AL Mahmood</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh</b>