

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_99142
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on formwork construction technology of railway bridge
Type of the Article	Method 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)	1) Yes, it is. This paper focuses on the challenges and advancements in railway bridge formwork design and construction, precisely short-line method segmental prefabricated bridge formwork. It examines the Zhengzhou-Xuchang urban railway viaduct project and discusses formwork types, design, and construction techniques. The paper highlights the characteristics of formwork design and construction through engineering examples, providing a theoretical foundation for future bridge formwork projects. 2) The title is appropriate. 3) The abstract is good 4) Yes. 5) Yes. 6) Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1) The article is well written.	
Optional/General comments	In relation to section 5: a) Visual aids: The inclusion of diagrams, illustrations, or photographs to support the text would help readers visualize the formwork design, installation, and removal processes. These visual aids could provide a better understanding of the concepts discussed in the article. b) Safety considerations: The article mentions that the template design should be safe and reliable, but it does not provide detailed information on safety measures or precautions that should be taken during the installation and removal process. Expanding on this topic would enhance the article's usefulness for construction professionals.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valdecy Pereira
Department, University & Country	Federal Fluminense University, Brazil