

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JERR_90592  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Determination of energy dissipation in a nappe flow with a fully developed hydraulic jump on stepped spillway using an elastic ball that bounces down a rigid stair. |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In all comparisons between the experimental results of the previous researches and the new proposed method must be made on the basis of the statistical analysis only to show the degree of agreement ( not on the shape of curve concavity). This should be done before the last conclusion.</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, it can be noted that the method of writing this manuscript is not similar to the scientific manuscripts approved in reputable journals, especially the clarification and analysis of the results of the figures 2 to 8.</li> <li>There is a need to add references to some sentences and equations for example: one-third of dams built in Europe and.....Page1, equation (3) page 3, COR constant .....ect</li> <li>Image number one is exactly the same as Figure number one. It is better to put the Symbols for researcher Chanson,1994, on figure one for example: total head loss, <math>\Delta H</math>, the residual head, <math>H_e</math>, at the bottom of the spillway <math>H_1</math>, <math>h</math> in equation 2 .....etc</li> <li>There are two paragraphs that are not clear at all, namely: 2.1, 2.11and 2.1.1.1 expects that they are incomplete or omitted</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of this study is analytical comparison between elastic pinball that descended one step with nappe flow on stepped falls.</li> <li>It is better to use the third person formulation when writing manuscript instead of "the authors..."</li> </ul> <p>The manuscript is based on analogical comparison between energy loss of elastic pinball that descended one step each bounce with the energy losses of water falling in stepped spillway.</p> <p>Notes:<br/>The importance of this study is analytical comparison between elastic pinball that descended one step with nappe flow on stepped falls.<br/>In general, it can be noted that the method of writing this manuscript is not similar to the scientific manuscripts approved in reputable journals, especially the clarification and analysis of the results of the figures 2 to 8.<br/>It is better to use the third person formulation when writing manuscript instead of "the authors..."<br/>There is a need to add references to some sentences and equations for example: one-third of dams built in Europe and.....Page1, equation (3) page 3, COR costsnt .....ect<br/>Image number one is exactly the same as Figure number one. It is better to put the Symbols for researcher Chanson,1994, on figure one for example: total head loss, <math>\Delta H</math>, the residual head, <math>H_e</math>, at the bottom of the spillway <math>H_1</math>, <math>h</math> in equation 2 .....etc<br/>There are two paragraphs that are not clear at all, namely: 2.1, 2.11and 2.1.1.1 expects that they are incomplete or omitted.<br/>In all comparisons between the experimental results of the previous researches and the new proposed method must be made on the basis of the statistical analysis only to show the degree of agreement ( not on the shape of curve concavity). This should be done before the last conclusion.<br/>Finally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript structure is not bad.</li> <li>The manuscript is accepted and it is better to include the above suggestions.</li> <li>There is no need to review this paper.</li> </ul> |  |

**Review Form 1.6**

**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> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                               |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Shaker A. Jalil</b>        |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Duhok University, Iraq</b> |