

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98034
Title of the Manuscript:	Finite element analysis and optimization of medium truck frame based on ANSYS
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. This article provides information on the study of medium truck frame and modelled using CATIA. Two general working conditions have been investigated and optimized. The results provide useful guideline for the development of truck frame. If possible, the actual field test could be carried out to further validated the simulation results. 2. Title is appropriate. 3. Abstract should contain the key research outcomes and the key findings. 4. Formatting is generally fine. 5. Sound scientific and technical. 6. The number of references is not sufficient. Suggest increasing to at least 20.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general, the English is well written without major grammatical errors. However, please doublecheck on the minor errors.	
Optional/General comments	This article provides good simulation works. However, it would be great to have some field test in the future.	

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:	Chew Kuew Wai
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia