

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is good for the scientific community. It is well written. It presents and describes a problem and proposes a solution. There are adequate diagrams and tables. The methodology is good too.</p> <p>The title is suitable. However perhaps a shorter title would be better? E.g. Urban Pocket Parks could be removed.</p> <p>The abstract is good. It is a bit on the shorter side.</p> <p>The subsections are good. However they can be improved and fine tuned.</p> <p>It is difficult to say, but the science behind the manuscript seems to be logically ok.</p> <p>There are sufficient references for sure.</p> <p>I strongly suggest to improve the layout of the paper and tidy it up. It is suggested that the authors improve the text. There are some inconsistencies and better explanations are possible.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language quality is good. However it is suggested to improve it.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tony Spiteri Staines
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta