EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
1. Correct Notational Inconsistencies: Ensure consistent use of symbols, particularly for terms like "r" and "R" representing moment of inertia, to avoid confusion. 2. Detailed Comparison with FEM: Include a more comprehensive analysis highlighting the differences and advantages of the Galerkin approach compared to FEM, both qualitatively and quantitatively. 3. Expand Practical Applications Discussion: Deepen the discussion of real-world applications, including additional data or visual aids to better illustrate the practical relevance of the proposed model in structural engineering. 4. Optimize Figures: Improve the resolution and formatting of figures to ensure high-quality visuals suitable for the final published version.	**1. Done** **2. Thank you for your comments on our manuscript. We appreciate your suggestions and have revised our manuscript accordingly.** **Regarding your request to include a more comprehensive analysis highlighting the differences and advantages of the Galerkin approach compared to FEM, we would like to clarify that our study focuses on the application of the Galerkin method to analyze the dynamic response of non-uniform damped Rayleigh beams. We believe that the Galerkin approach is more suitable for this specific problem due to its ability to capture the underlying physics accurately and efficiently.** **We have added a brief discussion on the advantages of the Galerkin approach, highlighting its accuracy, efficiency, and physical consistency. We believe that this revised discussion addresses your concerns and provides a clearer understanding of the benefits of the Galerkin method for this specific application.** **3. Done** **4. Done**