

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_91088
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF THE NUMBER OF SPLINED BLADES OF A LOCALLY-FABRICATED TURBINE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF A SIMPLIFIED PICO HYDROPOWER SYSTEM
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This work is organized and does not require many modifications. Also, there is a heavy reliance on the references in the text and their arrangement is logical. There is no ambiguity in this work. There are some notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the contribution of work? 2. The abstract needs modifications. The abstract must contain no more than 200 words. 3. Please, explain with mathematical equations the shape of the proposed method. 4. Compare the work done with other work on the same topic. 5. What is the capacity of the used turbine? The same for the generator? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I've used more than 12 references by Edeoja, A. O. and that's quite a lot. You must use 10 percent of the references for any author of the total number of references. Try reducing and replacing references with other references. 2. The conclusion needs to be modified. 3. Figures need more comments in the text. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the main objectives of this work? 2. Mention the pros and cons of the proposed method? 	

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:	Habib Benbouhenni
Department, University & Country	Nisantasi University, Turkey