



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>)

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>1 - The introduction is too rough.</p> <p>(1) The arguments need to be supported by references, but the first three paragraphs of the introduction do not have references.</p> <p>(2) The references in this article are too old, too few.</p> <p>(3) The existing references are only a simple list, and the author should summarize the references.</p> <p>2 - It is recommended to place the verification study 'Comparison between finite element and analytical results' before the 'Results and discussion'.</p> <p>3 - The comparative study is too rough.</p> <p>4 - The focus of this paper is on the effect of compacted layer, but only one section 'Comparison between finite element and analytical results' in the 'Results and discussion' has studied this.</p>	<p>First, I would like to thank you for your valued recommendations. Please consider the following modification I made to the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- I added additional recent previous studies 2- In section introduction I added scope of the research 3- In section comparison between FEM results and analytical solution results I added the case for footings resting on compacted sand and i placed this section before results and discussion 4- In section results and discussion I added more cases (footing width (1.5, 2m).
Minor REVISION comments	What is the basis for the value of the parameter in the numerical simulation? From prototype testing or model testing, or other? Please explain it in the paper.	The values are obtained from codes of design and previous experience
Optional/General comments	What is the research background of the article? Be clear.	

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