

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Point 1: The Abstract is quite general, the main problem statement and objective of this research need to be discussed and presented in a better version.

Response 1: We thank the reviewer for this valuable suggestion. The abstract has been revised accordingly.

Point 2: The background and literature in the introduction section must be further improved by discuss additional references within the scope of the current study; specifically those published in the latest five years. The presented literature was prepared based on old and very limited references, where only 1 paper from total 13 references is within the latest 5 years, which is Ref. [9].

Response 2: The reviewer's suggestion has helped us significantly in enhancing the quality of the introduction. The introduction has been revised in accordance with the reviewer's suggestion, and recent references were added.

Point 3: The research gap and objective of this research should be clearly highlighted and discussed in the introduction.

Response 3: We thank the reviewer for their valuable suggestion. We have accordingly emphasized more on the purpose of this paper in the introduction, and the limitations of this paper were included in the conclusion.

Point 4: The technical writing of the results discussions must be improved to properly justify the objective of this research. For example, need to discuss scientifically the reason why CFRP bars achieved higher bond strength than the GFRP bars for the same concrete mixture (strength)?.

Response 4: Based on the reviewer's suggestion and analogy, we have discussed the results with greater detail and have proposed suitable explanations. According to the experimental results of this study, for the same strength of concrete, higher the tensile strength, greater the adhesion strength; therefore, CFRP exhibited a higher adhesion strength than GFRP. This could be attributed to the greater resistance provided by the reinforcing bars with high tensile strength against the pull-out load, even under the same frictional force. These test results are similar to those of previous studies, which have been cited in the reference list.

Point 5: The conclusions are too general, and the limitation of the current study should be clearly highlighted.

Response 5: We agree with the reviewer that the conclusions could be improved. The limitations of this paper were added to the conclusion section accordingly.