

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? R) The manuscript presents an empirical proposal; Research on application of segmental prefabrication method in railway bridge construction. I think authors need to clarify so that they can contribute to the literature. 2. Is the title of the article adequate? R) It's adequate. 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? R) No, it is too brief, it does not present the objective, methodological procedures, results and conclusion 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript adequate? R) For the empirical study yes, but from the theoretical point of view it is very succinct 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R) Empirically, there is a lack of more scientific knowledge 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? R) There are 12 in total, no procedure for searching and filtering the references was presented. Since only 2 are references after 2019.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK, but needs a review	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sérgio Murilo Petri
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil