ReviewForm3

JournalName:	JournalofEngineeringResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_JERR_129287**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**ResearchontheStabilityofSteelPipeColumn-BergerBeamSupportSystem**
Typeofthe Article	**OpinionArticle**

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer'scomment	**Author'sFeedback***(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatory thatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)*
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Themanuscriptisscientificallyplausiblebutincompleteinitsmethodology,validation,and explanation of results. While the fundamental concepts discussed are correct, the lack of validation and quantitative rigor makes it difficult to fully ascertain the accuracy of the findings.	
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	No, Thetitlereferstoananalysisoftheberger beamsupportsystem,buttheresearchfocusesonthe Baileybeamsupportsystem.Pleaseclarifythedistinctionbetweenthesetwosystems andensure consistency between the title and the content of the research.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinth is section? Please write your suggestions here.	Theabstractmentionsthatthesupportsystemhasgoodstability,butthenecessityforconductinga stabilityanalysisisnotclearlyarticulatedinthescript.Additionally,clarifytheexistingresearchgaps and explicitly highlight the scope of this study.	
Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrite here.	Yes Thismanuscriptaddressesacrucialaspectofstructuralengineering.Withimprovementsin clarity, structure, and discussion, it can provide significant contributions to the field.	
Arethereferencessufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Thegivenreferenceissufficient	

ReviewForm3

Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications?	Thearticlesuffersfromgrammaticalerrorsandunclearphrasing,especiallyinSection1.A thorough language review are required for clarity and coherence.	
Optional/Generalcomments	1. The introduction gives an overview of the steel pipe column-Bailey beam support system but confuses the Berger beam with the Bailey beam. This inconsistency needs to be clarified. Are the systems being compared, or is this a misstatement? 2. The abstract mentions that the support system has good stability, but the necessity for conducting a stability analysis is not clearly articulated in the script. 3. In the introduction section, discuss the limitations of the previous studies and how yourmodel addresses these gaps, if applicable. This approach not only validates your findings but also underscores the contribution of your study to the field. 4. Critical details about the elements, such as their material properties, geometric dimensions, and boundary conditions, are either missing or not adequately elaborated. Furthermore, the specific characteristics of the rods, such as their dimensions, stiffness, and connection methods, are not clearlyexplained, leaving gaps inunderstanding their rolewithin themodel. 5. In Section 2, titled "Buckling Analysis," the analysis of buckling modes is visually well-supported by figures but lacks a deeper explanation of the modes' significance. Discuss the implications of each mode in practical scenarios and include comparisons with theoretical or empirical benchmarks to validate the results. 6. Whilefigureslikebucklingmodesandload-displacementcurvesarehelpful,theirdescriptions are too brief and lack interpretation. 7. A comparison of these results with theoretical predictions or existing literature would further validate the findings and provide additional insight. This comprehensive approach will significantly improve the depth and quality of the buckling analysis presented in the study. 8. In this model, “Semi Rigid Connection” was established to limit the deformation in order to ensure stability. To achieve that, spring element is added. The properties and behavior of the springs, including their stiffness coefficients,load-bearing capacity, and interaction withother elements, are not explicitly stated. This lack of detailed information makes it challenging to assess the validity and robustness of the finite element model. A thorough explanation of these components is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the study and to ensure that readers can fully evaluate the methodology and results. 9. To validate the model and ensure its safety and reliability, it is essential to include a comparison with previous studies. Such a comparison helps establish the credibility of the modelbydemonstratingitsconsistencywithestablishedresearchandtheoreticalpredictions. 10. The results are presented descriptively but lack sufficient discussion linking findings to practical implications or prior research. Discuss how the identified critical buckling modes or the effect of semi-rigid connections can improve design standards. Highlight key takeawaysfor engineersd designers.	

ReviewForm3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Vivekanandan R**
Department, University & Country	**Government College of Engineering, India**