



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_49135
Title of the Manuscript:	NUMERICAL STUDY OF STRIP FOOTINGS BEHAVIOUR ON COMPACTED SAND
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p><i>initially, I like to greet the authors for the effort in preparing this paper.</i></p> <p><i>the paper dealt with a numerical study of strip footings behavior on compacted sand. It also showed the difference between the behavior of the foundation in both cases: loose sand and loose sand reinforced with a compacted sand layer.</i></p> <p><i>The researcher also completed a comparison between the digital model and the analytical models of Terzahi et Vesic.</i></p> <p>1- Formally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request to amend the research sections as follows (looking paper): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary - Introduction - Materials and methods - Results and discussion - Conclusions - References - Place brackets (1) (paragraph: materials used) - Figures 6 and 7: Writing is different, required to be adjusted according to the writing type of the paper. - Figure 9 does not exist, is requested to be added. <p>2- Subject:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors did not mention previous studies similar to the current research, which is important. - Authors did not specify their position on the results obtained from previous studies and what is new in this research. - Researchers did not explain where the properties of sand were obtained? Is sand carefully selected for this research? Or just random selection? - Poor bibliography of new research. <p>3. Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The researchers gave a significant number of illustrative results related to a width of 1 m. This is good but not enough. - It is necessary to add other results, for the Footing Widths 1.5 m and 2 m. 	<p>First, I would like to thank you for your valued recommendations. Please consider the following modification I made to the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- I added additional recent previous studies 2- The sand used in this research was obtained from field and its properties obtained from lab tests. 3- In section comparison between FEM results and analytical solution results I added the case for footings resting on compacted sand. 4- In section results and discussion I added more cases (footing width (1.5, 2m). 5- To verify the accuracy of obtained results a comparison was conducted between FEM results using Plaxis software and values obtained using analytical solutions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The results remain weak, unless compared to previous studies, and clarify the importance of what is new in this research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Suggested to be Figure 9 as shown in the paper.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	