

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127119
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Method for Rapid Layout of Bridge Models Based on BIM Technology
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### 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 paper addresses a critical issue in bridge engineering—the difficulty in applying BIM technology due to complex structures and varied terrains. The proposed solution using "Revit+Excel" and the Revit API is innovative and practical.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Research Method for Rapid Layout of Bridge Models Based on BIM Technology," is clear and conveys the primary focus of the article. However, it could be slightly refined for conciseness and impact. A suggested alternative title could be: "Rapid Bridge Layout Modeling Using BIM Technology: A Research Approach"	
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 effectively summarizes the study but could benefit from a more quantitative emphasis. For example, mention the extent of efficiency improvement achieved (e.g., "modeling time reduced by X%").	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The paper effectively details the development tools and processes. The use of C# and Revit API, along with Visual Studio and EPPLUS, demonstrates technical depth and a systematic approach. The introduction succinctly explains the challenges in bridge engineering and the limitations of existing methods (e.g., Dynamo). The paper clearly outlines its objective to develop a plugin for rapid parametric modeling.	
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 inclusion of figures (though not visible in this review) and step-by-step explanations of creating parametric families for bridge components and their integration into the model adds practical value. References to previous research and tools developed by other scholars provide context and validate the necessity of your approach. Emphasis on the improved modeling efficiency and accuracy underscores the practical benefits of the proposed method, making it highly relevant to professionals in bridge engineering.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ensure that all cited works are formatted consistently. Include complete details like publication year, journal, or conference name for references.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some sentences are overly long and could be simplified for better readability. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original: "The drawing method of 'linear components' is based on line positioning, so it is necessary to organize the coordinates of the two endpoints of the component, input these two endpoint coordinates and size parameters into Excel."</li> <li>• Suggested: "Linear components are positioned using endpoints, requiring their coordinates and size parameters to be organized in Excel."</li> </ul>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The abstract effectively summarizes the study but could benefit from a more quantitative emphasis. For example, mention the extent of efficiency improvement achieved (e.g., "modeling time reduced by X%").</li> </ul> <p><b>Literature Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ While the literature review is thorough, the discussion on existing tools (e.g., Dynamo) could benefit from a comparative analysis to highlight the advantages of your approach more explicitly.</li> </ul> <p><b>Figures and Visuals:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure that all referenced figures (e.g., Fig. 1–8) are clear, labeled, and contextualized within the text. It would help to include a brief caption summarizing what each figure demonstrates.</li> </ul> <p><b>Validation and Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paper lacks a detailed validation section. Provide quantitative results or a comparison (e.g., before vs. after using the plugin) to demonstrate the tool's effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion and Future Work:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion could be expanded to include broader implications for bridge engineering and suggestions for future research (e.g., extending the tool to other bridge types or integrating it with other BIM platforms).</li> </ul> <p><b>Practical Application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the technical development is well-covered, adding a practical example of implementation on an actual bridge project could make the paper more compelling.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on Limitations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefly discuss any limitations of the proposed plugin (e.g., potential challenges in user adoption or scalability).</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>R. Shreedhar</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Visvesvaraya Technological University, S.G. Balekundri Institute of Technology, India</b></p>