

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	JournalofEngineeringResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JERR_95820
TitleoftheManuscript:	MODELINGOF PHYSICALANDCOMPRESSIVETESTPROPERTIESOFTIGERNUTUSINGRESPONSESURFACEAPPROACH
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

Generalguidelinefor PeerReviewprocess:

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolicystatesthat**NO**manuscriptsshouldberejectedonlyonthebasisof'**lackofNovelty**',providedthemanuscriptis scientificallyrobustandtechnically sound.ToknowthecompleteguidelineforPeerReviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthis link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

ReviewForm 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>First: The abstract of this manuscript, as it stands, is poor and lacks principles for writing abstract of manuscripts. The summary should be rewritten according to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) Research background (research problem, justifications and importance) • 2) Research objectives (the main objective of the research) • 3) Research methodology (means, techniques, and methods) • 4) Research results (reviewing the new results reached by the researcher and the language of numbers) • 5) The most important conclusions <p>Second: Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results are not clear, the researcher did not succeed in discussing the figures and table, The author did not use scientific method to discuss the results compared to previous studies. <p>Third: references</p> <p>Some references are very old, and this contradicts solid scientific research, must be remove all references before year 2013.</p> <p>A) Ali S. Hashem, Faiq M. S. Al-Zwainy, "Statistical Evaluation of the Factors Affecting the Estimation of the Duration and Costs of Oil Projects", Journal of Optoelectronics Laser, Vol. 41, No. 7, 2022. p98-121. B) Abbas A Hameed, Faiq M. S. Al-Zwainy, "Statistical Evaluation of the Planning and Scheduling Management Process for Irrigation and Drainage Projects", JOURNAL OF ALGEBRAIC STATISTICS, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2022. p259-282. C) Faiq M. S. Al-Zwainy and Reem A. Mezher, "A STATE-OF-THE-ART SURVEY TO ESTIMATE CONSTRUCTION COSTS IN HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE PROJECTS: ANALYTICAL DIAGNOSTIC STUDY," INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CIVIL ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY (IJCIET), Vol. 9, No. 5, 20168.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Faiq M. S. Al-Zwainy
Department, University & Country	Al-Nahrain University, Iraq