

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_94982
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on engine speed control based on Tuna Swarm Optimization
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 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>While the manuscript propose to use tuna swarm optimization algorithm to optimize PID parameters of engine speed, which can be benefit by other algorithm regarding optimization of swarm. It can be considered that this work have an important for scientific community.</p> <p>I think if it can be re write as (PID Controller Parameters based on Tuna Swarm Optimization)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I think it is scientifically correct</p> <p>The manuscript provides insufficient references, and I recommended the author to enrich the manuscript by adding further references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>For the manuscript, the whole sentences have an acceptable quality of language which this allow a better communications, However, there is some errors in part of paragraphs. Therefore, it is required to improve that.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The overall of the article is looks good, however, it is required some revise in many parts, such as in abstract, methodology, experimental and conclusion. The revision is required to have concise, reliable and logical and should have more realistic.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ziad Shakeeb Al Sarraf
Department, University & Country	University of Mosul, Iraq