

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96669
Title of the Manuscript:	Applied Digital Documentation with Parametric 3D Modeling Functionality for Smart Forests & Urban Pocket Parks
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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. I believe that the manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. I consider the title appropriate. 3. In the abstract consider that the methodology should be clearer and complete. 4. Take note of point 3 and add clear results. 5. I believe that in order for the manuscript to be scientifically correct they must structure their paper: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Conclusions and Discussion; Acknowledgments, bibliography. 6. The bibliographic references are mostly current. I suggest that the methodology be explicit and specific, that the techniques, methods and tools used for this research be mentioned. I suggest that the resolution of the images in this manuscript be correct and that they be legible.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	If I consider the language appropriate.	
Optional/General comments	Interesting research.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antonia Mireles Medina
Department, University & Country	Instituto Tecnológico Superior Zacatecas Norte, México