



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_46475
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Floating Bridges on Bottom Topography
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**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors use an experimental set up to investigate the processes of erosion in the rivers under the floating bridges to find out the causes and solve problems of such type of installations. All major findings are well summarized in conclusion section. The abstract needs revision as mentioned in highlighted review file. The authors need to implement a thorough grammar check throughout the manuscript. Some minor corrections/suggestions in figures are suggested in review file.</p> <p>I have marked my suggestions/corrections in the Marked word file (see attached). This manuscript will be a good addition to literature on experiments Investigating the processes of erosion in the rivers under the floating Bridges to find out the causes and solve problems of such type Of installations. The abstract needs revision as mentioned in highlighted review file. The authors need to check Journal guidelines and template format to write Reference section. Was this experimental program in this project funded? If yes, the authors need to acknowledge the funding agency.</p> <p>In conclusion, this manuscript can be accepted with minor changes suggested in marked copy (please see attached review file).</p>	<p>Corrected as per the suggestion</p> <p>We appreciate the comments of the reviewer</p> <p>Manuscript formatted as suggested</p> <p>Correction done as suggested in the attached file</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Was this experimental program in this project funded? If yes, the authors need to acknowledge the funding agency. Other than above no issue.</p>	