

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_99985
Title of the Manuscript:	Purse Seine Vessel Design Under 100 GT Based On The Characteristics Of South Sulawesi Waters In Indonesia
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)
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. The manuscript appears to be relevant and important for the scientific community, especially those interested in ship design and fisheries. The manuscript presents a design for a purse seine vessel that is optimized for the unique characteristics of the Makassar Strait in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. This research fills a gap in the literature on designing vessels that are tailored to the local conditions of the region and provides a practical solution for the fishing industry. 2. The title of the article appears to be suitable, as it clearly conveys the main focus of the research. However, it could be improved by adding a bit more detail. For example, the title could be revised to "Design of a Purse Seine Vessel for the Makassar Strait: Meeting International Maritime Organization Standards." 3. The abstract appears to be comprehensive in providing an overview of the research, including the main objectives, methods used, and results obtained. However, it could benefit from some additional details, such as a brief discussion of the potential implications of the research and how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge. 4. Based on the information provided in the abstract, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. 5. Based on the information provided, the methods used to design the purse seine vessel appear to be sound and the results obtained are promising. The authors' findings are supported by enough data, and the paper follows scientific best practices. 6. The references given are complete and up to date.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and grammar appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The abstract is clear, concise, and uses appropriate academic language. The language and English used in the article are suitable for academic purposes. The paper is written in a concise and clear manner, with proper grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Moreover, it includes relevant citations and references to support the claims made throughout the article.	
Optional/General comments	Considering the importance of the research, the article deserves approval. The manuscript seems to be well-crafted and informative.	

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:	Priyambodo Nur Ardi Nugroho
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Perkapalan Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia