

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_106074
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of Digital Twin System for Harbor Cranes Based on Unity 3D
Type of the 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript has a great importance for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, it's not comprehensive and well-written. The manuscript should be rewritten consisting a specific introduction about cranes, objective of the study, methodologies/tools/techniques employed in the study, and most important results. No! The whole section needs a revision.</p> <p>Yes, it's.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Major revisions on language usage are needed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Upon checking the overall quality of the manuscript, the following general comments are given:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript needs major revision in terms of language usage and appropriateness. 2. All figures and tables should be and inserted automatically, not by hand. All tables and figures should be centered. 3. The research methodology is not well-written. Please re-write a clear methodology with the help of flow charts, and the reason why the method is proposed for the present study. 4. The methodology is not clearly written. The result and discussion section are missed. 5. The conclusion is poor, important findings of the study are missed. 6. Avoid writing citations by hand, use software like Endnote, Mendeley, etc., so that references will be automatically generated in the references section. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asefachew Belete Tseganeh
Department, University & Country	Woldia University, Ethiopia