

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>SURE</p> <p>WHY NOT?IT IS SUGGESTIVE AND EXHAUSTIVE</p> <p>SURELY</p> <p>SURELY</p> <p>CERTAINLY</p> <p>A GOOD HARVEST OF REFERENCES:GOOD</p>	<p>THIS PRÉCIS IS VERY AFFORDABLE FOR ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS WHO DESIRE THEIR PRECIOUS INSTRUMENTS DO NOT BREAK DOWN BY ODD USAGES.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>SURELY</p>	<p>IT IS COMPREHENSIBLE THAT THE PAPER HAS BEEN DRAFTED FROM AN AUTHOR WHO USES AN IDIOM PRACTICALLY DIFFERENT FROM ALL OTHER LANGUAGES, AND SO, GREETINGS AND COMPLIMENTS TO THE A</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>VERY GOOD PAPER, NO REDUNDANT OR PERIPATHETIC</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:	Lorenzo Martini
Department, University & Country	University of Siena, Italy