TABLE OF CORRECTIONS

Author: [redacted] **Supervisor 1:** [redacted]

Date of Comments: **Supervisor 2:**

Section	Reviewer's Comment	Author's Response	Section on Revised Document
		REVIEWER 1	
Cover Page	Delete "at the Department of Civil & Construction Engineering" and replace with "of".	The statement has been changed from *"…. the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering* ***at the Department of Civil & Construction Engineering,*** *University of Nairobi "* to *"… the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering of the University of Nairobi"*	Cover Page
Page ix	Abstract – It is suggested that in the last sentence delete "have importance globally and regionally, by providing" and replace with "provide".	The statement has been changed from "*The findings will have importance ~~globally and regionally, by providing~~ new avenues for…*" to "*The findings* ***provide*** *new avenues for… ".*	Page ix
Page ix	Abstract – Delete the last sentence.	The statement "*In Kenya, using FRP reinforcement will facilitate the realisation of the affordable housing programme, a key national agenda*" has been deleted.	Page ix
Page ix	Abstract – change from "In 1979, over 30 years ago; try over 30 years ago, in 1979".	Rebuttal – This statement was not in the proposal. This statement is also not in this revised proposal.	Page ix
Page 1-4	Introduction – Use of study is more specific than research	The word "*research*" has been replaced in multiple instances with the word "***study***" in the Introduction.	Page 1-4
Page 2	Problem Statement – Second last sentence, insert the word "understanding" after "In particular", and delete the word "yet".	The sentence has been changed from *"In particular, the behaviour of the bond and durability of FRP bars in concrete under loading and in different exposure conditions is not ~~yet~~ comprehensive."* To *"In particular,* ***the understanding*** *of the behaviour of the bond and durability of FRP bars in concrete under loading and in different exposure conditions in not comprehensive."*	Page 2

Section	Reviewer's Comment	Author's Response	Section on Revised Document
Page 2	Problem Statement – rephrase the last sentence as a need – "Therefore, there is a need to …"	The last sentence *"This research will compare the performance of FRP and steel reinforcement."* has been changed to "*Therefore, there is a need to compare the performance of FRP and steel reinforcement."*	Page 2
Page 2	Specific Objective 1 – delete the word "how".	The first objective has been changed from *"To characterise ~~how~~ the mechanical and physical properties of FRP bars…"* to *"To characterise the mechanical and physical properties of FRP bars…".*	Page 2
Page 2	Specific Objective 3 – Try Evaluate in place of Characterise.	The third specific objective has been changed from "*To ~~characterise~~ the durability of low-carbon concretes …"* to *"To **evaluate** the durability of low-carbon concretes…".*	Page 2
Chapter Two	Literature Review - The literature review including research gaps and conceptual framework are OK.	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Chapter Two
Page 23	Methodology – Omit Section 3.5 Outcomes	Section 3.5 has been omitted.	Page 23
Work Plan and Budget	Workplan and Budget are OK	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Work Plan and Budget
Page 26	Remove a header (10/05/2024) before Section 4.3.	The header (10/05/2024) has been removed.	Page 26
Page 26	Section 4.4 – Too early to decide on journals – Remove	Section 4.4 has been purged from the document.	Page 26
Reviewer's recommendation	The student to address comments and submit the final proposal.	The proposal has now been revised and is being resubmitted to the Faculty Postgraduate Studies Committee.	Revised Proposal Submission
REVIEWER 2			
Cover Page	Change "… in partial fulfilment …" to " … in fulfilment …"	The purpose statement has been changed from " … *in ~~partial~~ fulfilment …"* to " … *in fulfilment …"*	Cover page
Page 1	Background is OK	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 1
Page 2	Problem statement is clear.	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 2
Page 3	Objectives are clear	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 3
Page 3	Research questions are clear	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 3

Section	Reviewer's Comment	Author's Response	Section on Revised Document
Chapter 2	Literature Review is current and adequate	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Chapter 2
Chapter 2	Adequate attention has been given to theory, aspects of study objectives, referencing, format	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Chapter 2
Chapter 2	Adequate conclusion of literature review	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Chapter 2
Page 22	There is no clear methodology for Objective 3 and 4	The methodology of Objective 3 is Objective 4 is given in Section 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. Additional information on these two objectives have been included in Appendix A.3 and A.4 respectively.	Page 22 and Page 35-36.
Chater 3	The approach is inadequate	The approach is further described in Appendix A.	
Chapter 3	There is no approach given for statistical treatment of data	The approach is further described in Section 3.3. The sub-heading has been changed from *"Data Analysis"* to *"Statistical Treatment of Data"* and two additional paragraphs have been included to this section.	Page 23 - 24
Page 25	The budget is included	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 25
Page 25	The budget reflects the study methodology and work plan	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 25
Page 25	The budget is realistic	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 25
Page 24	The work plan is included	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 24
Page 25	The work plan relates to the budget	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 25
Page 24	The activities are allocated sufficient time.	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 24
Page 24	The time is adequate for a PhD	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Page 24
Turnitin Report	The anti-plagiarism report is not included	Rebuttal – The anti-plagiarism report was included on Pages 48 and 49. A plagiarism report has been included in this compiled submission as well.	Turnitin Report
Turnitin Report	The anti-plagiarism is not included and signed.	Rebuttal – The anti-plagiarism report was included on Pages 48 and 49. A plagiarism report has been included in this compiled submission as well.	Turnitin Report

Section	Reviewer's Comment	Author's Response	Section on Revised Document
Turnitin Report	There are no noted plagiarised statement or items.	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Turnitin Report
Minutes	The minutes of the departmental seminar are included.	The comment is well noted and acknowledged.	Seminar Minutes
Recommendation	The proposal can be revised and resubmitted.	The proposal has now been revised and is being resubmitted.	Recommendation
Page ii	An anti-plagiarism page signed by the student should be included	The proposal has an anti-plagiarism page signed by the student.	Page ii
Turnitin Report Page 48-49	A Turnitin report summary should be signed by the student and both supervisors	A Turnitin report summary signed by both the student and both the supervisors has been included.	Turnitin Report
Minutes Page 43-47	Minutes of a seminar in which the student presented the subject of the proposal complete with signed attendance list and signed by the student and two supervisors. The main supervisor should have attended the seminar.	Minutes of the seminar in which the student presented, and the main supervisor signed is included in the revised proposal. The main supervisor attended the seminar.	Seminar Minutes