

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_90654
Title of the Manuscript:	New equations for energy dissipation down a stepped spillway
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is written in an unacceptable manner. There is no need to mention the researchers whoes your work is based on their results in the abstract. The abstract is almost equal to the Conclusions Section. It is recommended to reformulate it including an introduction, the research significance, the general purpose of the paper, and the general conclusions without the need of addressing values.</li> <li>2. The introduction should be separated into different paragraphs. Extremely long paragraphs are very difficult to read. The research looks like a research report rather than scientific research – the Authors must remember that any research program must verify a pre-defined hypothesis, e.g., the adequacy of the design procedure. Therefore, please reconsider the motivation of this work.</li> <li>3. The paper presents several written English mistakes that need proofreading.</li> <li>4. Rewrite the conclusions in the form of points that include the most significant findings drawn from this research</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sheelan Mahmoud Hama
Department, University & Country	University of Al Anbar, Iraq