

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_101203
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural design and hydrodynamic coefficient calculation of observation-class ROVs
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

Review Form 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) YES</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) YES</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? YES</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? NO (see Reviewer's comment to the right)</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? YES</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. YES</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>All comments are shown on the attached corrected manuscript in bold red colours</p> <p>1- for bad English languages.</p> <p>2- arranging and numbering sub-sections.</p> <p>3- some abbreviations have to be explained explicitly.</p> <p>4. fig. 7 is not in the supposed position</p> <p>5- fig.8 should show more explanations , some characters ,i .e. U ,v, β are not shown.</p> <p>6- Eq. given as #1 and #2 should be given as usual numbers , i.e. 1 and 2</p> <p>7- whenever , a figure will be given in the text , the author should give a note for that , say (should write see fig)</p> <p>8- figs 9-12 are not shown clearly in the text , therefore should be replaced by cleared ones?</p> <p>9- figs 13-16 should be enlarged , so that details on them can be cleared.</p> <p>10- figs 17-20 , have not pointed out to them in the text?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? NO(see Reviewer's comment to the right)</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments All the mentioned Reviewer comments should be considered before acceptance for 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Eldaghmah
Department, University & Country	College of Criminal Justice, Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, Saudi Arabia