

Review Form 1.7


Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98130
Title of the Manuscript:	Summary of Research on Digital Twin Workshop
Type of the Article	Minireview 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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. Using digital technology to improve production and manufacturing efficiency is a current research hotspot. This manuscript analyzes the research progress of digital twin workshop and has good reference significance</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. It's not comprehensive. This manuscript introduces the architecture, key technologies, application to workshop production of DTW. This part should be reflected in the abstract.</p> <p>4. It's a bit unreasonable. For example, it has two 1: 1. INTRODUCTION. 1.THE CONCEPT OF A DIGITAL TWIN WORKSHOP. The manuscript contains no conclusions and the author's prediction of the development trend of the digital workshop.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. As a summary article, this manuscript needs to add references to articles from the past three years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. However, the author needs to modify the grammatical tenses in the manuscript. At the same time, the format of Figure 1 should be modified. Some words are split into two parts . For example:</p> 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peng-Xiao Zhu
Department, University & Country	XCMG Research Institute, China