

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127388
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of the presence or absence of subdivision plate on the horizontal bearing characteristics of suction pile dam
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

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>
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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it investigates the horizontal bearing characteristics of suction pile dams with and without subdivision plates using numerical simulation. The study's findings offer critical insights into optimizing structural design for estuary regulation, addressing the challenges of sediment management in the Yellow River estuary. The results, particularly the 60.8% improvement in horizontal bearing capacity, demonstrate the potential of subdivision plates to enhance the structural efficiency of suction pile dams.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 of the article provides a clear overview of the research objective, methodology, and key findings. Also, it can also mention failure modes and earth pressure distribution under different conditions would strengthen the abstract by emphasizing how the findings contribute to understanding structural behavior.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough methodology and reliance on established numerical simulation techniques. The use of ABAQUS finite element software, a widely recognized tool in structural and geotechnical engineering, ensures accurate modeling of the suction pile dam's horizontal bearing characteristics.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add another 10 to 15 references.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>However, some areas could benefit from further clarification:</p> <p>Practical Implications: While the manuscript highlights improvements in horizontal bearing capacity, it could delve deeper into the implications of these findings for real-world construction and maintenance of estuary regulation systems.</p> <p>Comparative Analysis: Including more direct comparisons with alternative foundation types could strengthen the argument for using suction pile dams with subdivision plates.</p> <p>Validation: While the numerical model is rigorous, some discussion on potential experimental validation or field data comparisons would enhance the manuscript's robustness.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-prepared and addresses a topic of significant interest in the field of geotechnical and structural engineering. However, a few editorial improvements are suggested to enhance the clarity and professionalism of the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language and Grammar: While the manuscript is generally well-written, minor grammatical issues and typographical errors should be reviewed and corrected to improve readability. 2. Abstract Length: The abstract could be refined to ensure a balance between technical detail and brevity, providing a clear and concise summary of the study. <p>References Format: Verify that all references follow the journal's citation style and are complete, including DOIs where applicable.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sharath P C</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Jain University, India</p>