

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)	I have thoroughly read the article. My decision is major revision. Kindly see the below comments and revise it: 1. Title of the article needs to be revised... 2. In the abstract of the article, objectives and problem definition written but needs to be revised for the understanding to readers too. 3. Add the more and relevant keywords in the article 4. First paragraph of the introduction section needs to be revised..last two lines meaning is not understanding in first paragraph of introduction section. 5. I found the lumpy references in the introduction section..for a good research article lumpy references must be lower 6. Figures 1 and 2 need to be visible properly. 7. See the table 1 properly 8. How frequently experimentations have been carried out by researchers.. 9. See the conclusion of the paper and if possible then add it in bullet form so It will be very helpful for readers. 10. See the future work 11. See all the references properly	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hitesh Panchal
Department, University & Country	GEC, India