

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_106621
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Manufacture of Rainfall Measuring Instrument Based on ATmega329P Microcontroler Using Hall Effect Sensor
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> <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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. A scientific community consists of scientists working in a particular field of science and, most importantly, of their relationships and interactions This type of words are to be include in the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Some what it is suitable but we have to change the title.</p> <p>3. Abstract of the article is comprehensive but according to the suggestions mentioned the abstract has to be rewrite. Abstract should be more specific and it includes the following... 1) Outline of the implementation 2) In abstract itself include the methodology,results,discussion write up that has to be change Rewrite the abstract if possible</p> <p>4. Literature review section is missing in the article. There is no subsection in the manuscript. Result section part has to be modified. No comparison section is provided in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. No the manuscript is not scientifically correct because the manuscript looks like general article.</p> <p>6. Only 8 references are included more number of references has to be provided. Citations are missing in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. In manuscript most of the content are from the reference 1 article.</p> <p>2. In methodology section we have to introduce about the output section.</p> <p>3. Figures in the implementation part needs is ok but need more number of results to satisfy the content of the article.</p> <p>4. Comparison table is missing with the different techniques.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	M Pradeep
Department, University & Country	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for Women, India