

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_108073
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Olorunsogo Gas-Fired Power Plant Phase I
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The specifications of the Olorunsogo gas power plant, this must be highlighted. Equipped with data collection methods and instruments. 2. The title of the article is appropriate. 3. Abstract requires template improvement. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The text is scientifically correct. 6. Requires additional literature to support the introduction subsection. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The quality of articles in Bahasa/English is suitable for scientific communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The scientific work has been well prepared, but literature is needed to support the quality of the research. Methodology sessions require additional specifications and data collection methods. Next, you need to pay attention to writing, images and graphics that are less clear. Furthermore, the conclusion requires confirmation that describes the novelty of the paper according to the results of the analysis.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Safril
Department, University & Country	Politeknik STMI Jakarta, Indonesia