

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_120556
Title of the Manuscript:	Study and optimization of three-dimensional free bending forming law for metal hollow members
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the innovation of the present work? 2. The article requires thorough editing for attention to detail. 3. The idea of the work is not clear. What is the current problem in the literature? It is more important to analyze the literature rather than to simply list them. 4. Several future research directions should be presented at the end of the paper 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the abstract: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The abstract does not say anything about the background of the problem. It should be stated right at the beginning. b. The abstract could also provide a brief statement about the implications or applications of the findings. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the experimental section, the authors have not stated the reason for the selected parameters. What are the criteria for selecting the parameters and their levels? 2. Discuss the results in more details and compare it with the previous researches. 3. Because it is more suggestive, the comparative analysis of results should be also a percentage analysis. What about errors, in percentages, between the experimental and analytical results? 4. The authors should explain the motivation of the research and how the own results will improve the knowledge progress in the subject approached. 5. The authors tried to explain their results which is good but what I suggest the authors to follow this method: first show the results in form of figures, explain the behaviour of the results, explaining why and how this behaviour happens and lastly which most importantly to justify their result by comparing with existing journal articles. 6. The conclusions have to be better organised and better presented. It is not necessary to repeat in detail the information presented in the Results and Discussion section. What about recommendations for industry? 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The literature review should be rearranged and rewritten in order to improve the language. 2. Need to add at least five recent references (2021-2024). This will enhance the literature review. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper's language is superficial. English must be improved. I observed that the authors were unable to effectively convey their ideas due to incorrect punctuation, spelling, and lengthy sentences, particularly in the introduction. Try to organize your work and presentation of the results in a concise manner with short paragraphs not exceeding 150 words.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marwan T. Mezher
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq