

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102597
Title of the Manuscript:	Research and Design of Hammer Blade Crusher Crushing Fineness
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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>No, "Design Optimization of Hammer Blade Crusher to Improve the Crushing Performance"</p> <p>No, the abstract should contain: - A brief introduction, methodology, results with no discussion in it, and conclusion. What is the significance of this paper?</p> <p>The author doesn't follow the scientific paper writing format</p> <p>No, all references listed in this paper are later than 2018, the format is incorrect; authors can use referencing tools like Mendeley.</p> <p>Additional comments The scientific contribution of the study should be stated clearly in the abstract. The introduction part is surprisingly short. The author needs to discuss the current status of the field, clearly discuss the research limitations in the area, and define the objective of the current paper. Citation in the text should be started by [1] instead of [4] To increase the clarity of the paper, it needs to be methodology and results, and a discussion section. In the conclusions, the main findings of the study should be presented. In the numerical section, authors need to specify mesh type, mesh quality, grid dependency, etc. Please use clear background (fig. 7-10), the resolution of the figures is less.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is very poor, e.g. In the abstract section, the first three/four sentences are written without full stop and upper case letters. The paper is full of grammatical errors. The writing style is difficult to understand</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Generally, the paper fails to satisfy the minimum requirements of scientific publication.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdulbasit Nasir Jemal
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia