

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_121097
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the application status of 3D point cloud
Type of the Article	Review article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper discussed about latest technology useful for industrial manufacturing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Study on the application status of 3D point cloud	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. Abstract is good. AIML in cloud print is mentioned in abstract but not included with references. General statement was given.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The reason for thinking that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound is 1. It is latest topic 2. Well explained with necessary flow 3. Advantages and limitations are clearly mentioned	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Ref.3 is of year 2021. But in Section 2, while citing, it is mentioned as recent years. Advice: consider more latest reference like of the year 2023 or 24.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Hari Krishna
Department, University & Country	B V Raju Institute of Technology, India