

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_121032
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview of the development and current status of pumped storage power plants
Type of the Article	Method Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the evolution and current state of pumped storage power plants, which is crucial for understanding their role in sustainable energy development.</p> <p>The detailed historical context, starting from the Neitra Power Station, offers valuable insights into the technological advancements in this field.</p> <p>The emphasis on the integration of TBM technology in modern construction methods highlights significant improvements in efficiency and quality, which is highly informative.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Figures 1 and 2 should be better integrated into the text, ensuring they directly support and enhance the discussion.</p> <p>The section on conventional construction techniques could include more comparative data to highlight the improvements brought by TBM technology.</p> <p>The conclusion would benefit from a brief summary of the key points discussed, reinforcing the manuscript's main contributions and future research directions.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The discussion on the future focus areas, such as modularization and intelligent design of TBM equipment, shows a forward-thinking approach that could drive further innovation.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured and provides a balanced view of both the advantages and challenges associated with the construction and operation of pumped storage power stations.</p> <p>The abstract could be streamlined to avoid redundancy and improve clarity, particularly by condensing the discussion on environmental challenges. While the introduction effectively sets the stage, it could benefit from a more focused narrative that directly ties climate challenges to the need for pumped storage power stations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A thorough grammar and language review is recommended to enhance readability and ensure the manuscript maintains a professional tone throughout.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arun Raj
Department, University & Country	NIT Durgapur, India