Review Form 3

Book Name:	Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_3975**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of slope on energy dissipation for flow over a stepped spillway**
Type of the Article	**Book chapter**

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.	This manuscript makes a significant contribution to the field of hydraulic engineering by investigating energy dissipation in stepped spillways with varying slopes. It deepens our understanding of hydraulic jump behavior, a critical factor in spillway performance and safety. The study's findings provide practical guidance for designing more energy-efficient spillways, helping to optimize resource use. Additionally, these insights can lead to reduced construction costs and improved operational sustainability in hydraulic infrastructure.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, the title is a good reflection of the scope and content of the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is clear, well-organized, and summarizes the objectives, methods, and key findings. However, a brief mention of the study's practical implications would make it more complete.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound; the experimental data align well with theoretical principles and findings from the literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	References are sufficient and include both recent and foundational works.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally adequate, though minor grammatical errors in certain sections should be addressed to improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	• The manuscript could benefit from a more explicit discussion of its limitations, such as the scale of physical models and their generalizability to full-scale structures. • Figures, such as Fig. 9 and Fig. 11, would benefit from clearer annotations to improve interpretability.	

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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Taylan Demir**
Department, University & Country	**Ankara University, Turkey**