

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_99120
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on application of segmental prefabrication method in railway bridge construction
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important to the scientific community. It presents adequate information on the technical characteristics, the advantages and disadvantages of segmental prefabrication, in bridge construction technology. The title is suitable enough. The abstract has sufficient required merits. The subsections and structure of the manuscripts are appropriate. Yes, the work presented in the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references quoted are adequate. Required Corrections in Sections 5 There should be no space before semicolon, full colon, brackets open and close. Samples from the manuscript requiring corrections are shown below: as follows : span ; beams ; " Several Opinions buildings. "</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly presentation.	
Optional/General comments	Section 6 The conclusion of the write-up should be presented in a more convincing manner.	

Comment [H1]: as follows:

Comment [H2]: span;

Comment [H3]: beams;

Comment [H4]: "Several Opinions buildings "

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marvel Akinyemi
Department, University & Country	Covenant University, Nigeria