

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_123194
Title of the Manuscript:	MATLAB combined with APDL simulation -- taking Y-shaped steel turnout pipe as an example
Type of the Article	Opinion 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 is scientifically oriented and I like the whole idea. Although the author needs to readjust and rearrange the research work. The scientific tools used are excellent and require proper arrangement for reporting the work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be reconstructed because it does not represent the image or intent of the research work properly.	
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>The abstract of this research work is not comprehensive enough. Every abstract contains a summary of the introduction, method used, result, and conclusion.</p> <p>In this work's abstract, the introduction is too short and does not describe the work enough.</p> <p>For the method used, it is not well arranged and needs to be properly arranged.</p> <p>The result was not discussed at all in the abstract. The summary of the result should be included.</p> <p>Also, the summary of the conclusion was not emphasized at all. The authors should include this as well.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>For the subsections and the structure of the manuscript.</p> <p>The content of the introduction is too short and does not speak enough about the research work. The authors should add more to at least 3 to 4 well-arranged paragraphs. Also, in the introduction, the citations of 1-5 are not found but 6-8 was recognised. The authors should take note and it's very necessary. Also, adequate reference citations should be added, at least 10-15 citations.</p> <p>The method was discussed to some extent but requires more clarity and should be well arranged. If possible, with some citations.</p> <p>The results are ok but should be arranged well, step by step. If possible, with reference citations too.</p> <p>The conclusion is not comprehensive enough. The authors should restructure it.</p> <p>Finally, the references are not sufficient enough, just 8 references, which is too short, please authors should add more references at least 25 to 30 or more, with recent ones if possible. This will make the research work more robust and scientific.</p> <p>This would entice excellent citation of this research work in the future.</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>The research work is highly scientific because scientific tools like MATLAB, and Ansys were used and they represent the technicality of the work.</p> <p>Also, the authors designed a structure used for the analysis of the work, which involves some mathematical calculations. These are scientific tools and are well recognized globally for such kind of research.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	<p>No.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient enough, authors should add up to make at least 30 references if possible.</p> <p>The references cited are not recent enough, out of 8 references recorded, only 4 are the most recent. Please, authors should cite recent references if possible.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English Language used is ok but the authors can improve and report more scientifically for proper communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work is a good work but the authors should make all corrections so that this work can attract more readers and citations soon.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muyiwa Adedapo Fajobi
Department, University & Country	Covenant University, Nigeria