

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_104951</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Proposed Buys-Ballot Estimates for Multiplicative Model with the Error Terms</b>
Type of the Article	<b>research</b>

### **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>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript can be more or less relevant for the scientific community due to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the subject is well defined and tangible</li> <li>the technical aspects are justified and detailed</li> </ul> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>3. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript' structure is appropriate</p> <p>5. From a quality point of view, the paper is technically correct.</p> <p>6. In my opinion, more references from last years (2021-2023) must be added</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Point 1: the introductory part should be more extensive and explicit.</p> <p>Point 2: the literature review should be updated (only 2 title from 2021 and only one from 2022 and 2023)</p> <p>Point 3: Authors should explicitly declare the limitations of the study</p> <p>Point 5. Discussion should be completely revised. In this section the authors should critically discuss their findings comparing them with previous studies, while this section must include theoretical implications</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai Caramihai
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica, Romania