

### Review Form 3

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

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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.	The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the development and current status of pumped storage power plants, highlighting their importance in the transition to sustainable energy systems. The discussion on the evolution of technology, from drilling and blasting methods to the use of tunnel boring machines (TBMs), provides valuable insights into the advancements in construction efficiency and safety. The paper's emphasis on the future directions for research and development in this field, particularly concerning the modularization and intelligent design of TBM equipment, underscores its relevance to the scientific community and industry stakeholders.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the article.	
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.	The abstract provides a concise and comprehensive overview of the manuscript's main points, including the historical development, technological advancements, and future challenges of pumped storage power plants. No significant additions or deletions are necessary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, clearly delineating the historical context, technological advancements, and future directions in the field.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It thoroughly discusses the development and current status of pumped storage power plants, highlighting key technological advancements and their implications for sustainable energy systems. The paper provides a solid foundation for future research and development, particularly regarding the mechanization and intelligent construction of these facilities.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of studies and reports relevant to the topic.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript could benefit from more diagrams or flowcharts, to illustrate the technological processes and future research directions discussed in the text.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Wenhan Fan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brown University, United States of America</b>