

### 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Title:</b><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></li><li><b>2. Abstract:</b><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></li><li><b>3. Introduction:</b><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></li><li><b>4. Conclusions:</b><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></li><li><b>5. References:</b><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></li></ol>	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rehan Ahmad Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Aligarh Muslim University, India</b>