

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130296
Title of the Manuscript:	Three New Approaches to estimating Energy Losses in Stepped Spillways with the Channel slope of 8.9o.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. 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.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The abstract and conclusion sections should be streamlined to avoid redundancy. The main findings should be highlighted concisely in the conclusion without repeating results already discussed in the body of the article. This would enhance clarity and focus.</p> <p>The experimental setup needs further elaboration. Providing more details about how the air-water flow was measured and a clear description of the flow regimes (e.g., transitional and skimming flows) would improve the reader's understanding of the research methodology.</p> <p>A dedicated section comparing the new models to existing ones should be added. This comparison should emphasize how the proposed models advance current methods for estimating energy losses in stepped spillways, particularly by addressing limitations like the uncertain friction factor.</p> <p>More detailed explanations of the figures and their implications are necessary. This would make the study more accessible, especially for readers who are less familiar with the technical aspects of stepped spillways.</p> <p>The article should conclude with suggestions for future research or practical applications. These could include designing stepped spillways for varying environmental conditions or dams with different</p>	<p>We checked and did not find the redundancy you referred to.</p> <p>The residual energy and rate of energy dissipation were investigated at the downstream end of the spillways. They were calculated at two successive step edges for the three configurations based upon the detailed air-water flow measurements. The rate of energy dissipation $\frac{E}{H}$ max quantified the percentage of total energy loss along the stepped spillway, where Hmax is the upstream total head</p> <p>Comparision of the new models with the existing ones is beyond the scope of this article: please, note that every article has what it intends to achieve.</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>heights, expanding the scope of the study's relevance.</p> <p>The title needs to be revised to better reflect the study's scope and contributions. While it emphasizes energy losses in stepped spillways with a channel slope of 8.9°.</p> <p>The results section is underdeveloped and insufficient to support the claims made in the article. A more detailed analysis and discussion of the findings are necessary to strengthen the study's credibility. Without this, the results fail to substantiate the conclusions.</p> <p>In its current state, the article does not meet the standards of a high-quality academic paper. Significant improvements are required, particularly in presenting results, detailing the methodology, and discussing implications, to enhance its overall credibility and impact. The abstract and conclusion sections should be streamlined to avoid redundancy. The main findings should be highlighted concisely in the conclusion without repeating results already discussed in the body of the article. This would enhance clarity and focus.</p> <p>The experimental setup needs further elaboration. Providing more details about how the air-water flow was measured and a clear description of the flow regimes (e.g., transitional and skimming flows) would improve the reader's understanding of the research methodology.</p>	<p>We disagree</p> <p>I am sorry to state here that this comment here is unprofessional. I have published some articles in Scopus Indexed Journals. By the grace of God, I have also had the opportunity get some of the world renowned researchers in water resources to review some of my articles before submission for publication.</p>
--	---	---

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	