

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_97599
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Relationship between the Life of Power Transformers and the Moisture Content of Insulating Oil
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 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>	The manuscript important for scientific community, because it provides a Moisture Content control solution.  The title needs to be changed to describe the research  The abstract needs to be fixed  Need to fixed  Yes it is, however need to fixed from introduction to be clearer the intention of this study was carried out.  Yes there are	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes it is	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript has been well written, but it needs to be clarified regarding the background of the problem, the purpose and the results obtained to provide correlations so that the manuscript can be easily understood and contribute knowledge.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aldi Budi Riyanta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Politeknik Harapan Bersama, Indonesia</b>