

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130059
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Pylon of an Irregular Low-pylon Cable-stayed Bridge
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **PART 1:** 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reviewer Report</b></p> <p>The manuscript requires significant improvements to meet the standards of academic publishing. Below are specific comments and suggestions for the authors:</p> <p><b>1. Title:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The current title does not accurately reflect the content of the paper. A more appropriate title could be: <i>“Pylon of an Irregular Low-Pylon Cable-Stayed Bridge: A Review Study.”</i></li></ul> <p><b>2. Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The abstract needs to be revised to clearly state the major areas reviewed and their relevance in the context of the title. It should provide a concise summary of the scope, key findings, and conclusions of the study.</li></ul> <p><b>3. Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The introduction lacks a clear justification for the importance of this review. The authors should highlight the significance of studying irregular low-pylon cable-stayed bridges and identify the research gaps this review aims to address.</li></ul> <p><b>4. Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The conclusions section fails to provide substantive insights or major takeaways from the review. The authors should summarize the key findings and discuss their implications for research and practice.</li></ul> <p><b>5. References:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Although this is a review paper, only ten references are cited, which is insufficient to comprehensively cover the topic.</li><li>The references cited are not from standard or reputed journals, which raises concerns about the credibility and relevance of the sources.</li><li>Many references are outdated and fail to address current research trends in the field. The authors should incorporate more recent and high-impact studies to align the review with contemporary advancements.</li></ul>	<p><b>I have understood the reviewers' suggestions and have made changes to the comments.</b></p>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	<b>No</b>