

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105708
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Light Steel Roof Frame Construction Methods With Conventional Methods And Prefabricated Methods
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>)

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>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 manuscript does not show the importance of the scientific community. Introduction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Justify a clear problem statement for the comparison of the working methods of lightweight steel roof truss. b. Justify and elaborate on how the comparative analysis study between the conventional method and the prefabricated method determine the problem statement. c. Justify and prove how the simulation calculation of the budget plan and estimated time will be conducted. Literature Review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clear justification and elaboration with proof are needed for residential houses whose roofs have a gable shape. Methodology: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Justify and explain the process in detail for the comparison of conventional roof truss work and the prefabricated method that will be carried out in the Type A cluster project in this study with clear reason based on the problem statement. b. Explain and justify why in-depth analysis of the data has been used. Conclusion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clear justification and findings need to be stated accordingly based on the problem statement. b. Refine and restructure the conclusion accordingly. c. Elaboration and justification are needed based on the literature outcomes and prove it based on the problem statement outcomes of this study. d. Elaborate on the comparison of the conventional roof truss work and the prefabricated method that will be carried out in the Type A cluster project based on the gaps and literature findings. 2. The title of the article is suitable and focuses on the comparison of conventional methods and prefabricated methods. 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. Abstract: Need to be refined. Introduction: A clear definition and elaboration need to be justified the comparison of the working methods of lightweight steel roof truss. Problem Statement: A proper statement and justification need to be stated and elaborated to show the problem that this research intends to solve. Objective: A clear research objective needs to be stated based on answering the problem statement above. Methods: A proper statement and elaboration are needed to show what methods have been used and how these methods will assist in solving the problems and answering the objective of the research context. Results and Findings: The significance value of the conventional methods and prefabricated methods need to be stated and justify. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate and need to be restructured based on. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>2. Literature Review.</p> <p>3. Comparison Review.</p> <p>4. Methodology.</p> <p>5. Discussion.</p> <p>6. Conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct, where certain comparison and development are not properly evaluated and there is no clear problem statement for the comparison development.</p> <p>6. References: Need to be latest from the duration of 5 years from 2019 to 2023.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Proofreading needs to be done for clear sentences and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>2. All Abbreviations need to be stated clearly throughout the manuscript and re-check accordingly.</p>	
	<p>Refine and restructure the article for clear novelty that shows the valuable findings from the study and creates a better understanding of the readers' perspectives.</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:	Mailasan Jayakrishnan
Department, University & Country	School of Computing and Data Science, Xiamen University Malaysia, Malaysia