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Responses to recommendations for revision

The Editorial Committee on Journal of JSCE

We have carefully revised the manuscript in line with the reviewer’s comments. The manuscript submitted has been considerably improved as a result of following the reviewers’ comment, and we feel that is has been possible to improve the value of the manuscript. Furthermore, with regard to XX we think \_\_\_\_\_\_, and have YY. The responses to each of the reviewer’s comments are as follows.

We hope that this revised version will be regarded as worthy of publication in the Journal of JSCE. With our sincerest thanks for your attention to this matter.

Taro Doboku

Department of Civil Engineering, University of Civil Engineering

**Comments**

**Reviewer 1**:The manuscript examines the \_\_\_\_\_\_ methods that suggest problems in the XX model. Furthermore, its presents a concise method concerning the relationships between \_\_\_\_\_\_. However, the discussion of \_\_\_\_\_\_ is inadequate and (is/was) \_\_\_\_\_\_.

**(Response) …**

**Reviewer 2**:The paper introduces \_\_\_\_\_\_, and has a hitherto unfound novelty. Furthermore, it presents \_\_\_\_\_\_, and can be considered beneficial to readers. However, references to \_\_\_\_\_\_ are inadequate. If \_\_\_\_\_\_ were illustrated I believe that it would be highly beneficial to readers and improve the quality of the manuscript.

**(Response) …**

**Reviewer 3**:This study considers \_\_\_\_\_\_. The \_\_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_\_ is worthy of evaluation. However, \_\_\_\_\_\_ is unclear and it was not possible to appraise \_\_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_\_\_ regarding these points. Please consider these comments.

**(Response) …**

**Recommendation for revision**

**Type code:**

**A: matters requiring revision**

**B: matters where revisions would be preferable**

**C: other (not specific to the content, such as errors in codes, tables, unit systems etc. and comments)**

**Reviewer 1**

**Recommendation for revision 1**

Type code: B

Place (page, line): p.1, 3rd line of right-hand column

Details of recommendation for revision: is \_\_\_\_\_\_ appropriate?

Page, line in new manuscript:

No revisions

Response: after consideration by the authors it was felt to be appropriate and no revisions were made.

**Recommendation for revision 2**

Type code: A

Place (page, line): p.3，14th line of left-hand column

Details of recommendation for revision: Isn’t \_\_\_\_\_\_ mistaken for \_\_\_\_\_\_? Please revise.

Page, line in new manuscript: p.3, 2nd line of right-hand column

Response: We have revised in line with the reviewer’s comment.

**Reviewer 2**

**Recommendation for revision 1**

Type code: C

Place (page, line): The whole of Chapter 4

Details of recommendation for revision: Is (this/it) \_\_\_\_\_\_? Please confirm.

Page, line in new manuscript: The whole of Chapter 4

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have revised with the view that it is \_\_\_\_\_\_.

**Reviewer 3**

**Recommendation for revision 1**

Type code: B

Place (page, line): p.6, 4th line from the bottom of right-hand column

Details of recommendation for revision: The manuscript states \_\_\_\_\_\_; shouldn’t this be \_\_\_\_\_\_? With \_\_\_\_\_\_ it looks like \_\_\_\_\_\_ and makes \_\_\_\_\_\_ unclear.

Page, line in new manuscript: p.7, 10th line from the bottom of left-hand column

Response: We have added the following sentence to the end of the section: “However, there is a need for \_\_\_\_\_\_.”