

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_110539
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAFFIC MODEL AT NURTANIO ROAD CROSSINGS - ABDUL RAHMAN SALEH BANDUNG
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>(1) Importance for the Scientific Community: This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it proposes novel solutions to traffic congestion issues, which are crucial for improving urban traffic flow and safety.</p> <p>(2) Article Title: The current title, "Traffic Model at Nurtanio Road Crossings - Abdul Rahman Saleh Bandung," is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus and location of the study.</p> <p>(3) Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract of the article is comprehensive, outlining the purpose, method, and key findings of the study. To enhance its utility, a brief mention of specific alternative solutions identified by the study could be added.</p> <p>(4) Subsections and Structure: The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. It follows the typical academic paper format, including an introduction, methodology, analysis, discussion, and conclusion.</p> <p>(5) Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>References: The references seem sufficient and recent, providing a good background for the field of study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications. Overall, the paper is clear in expression and grammatically correct, fitting the standards of academic writing. However, there are minor grammatical errors and instances of inappropriate word usage in some parts. A careful proofreading and language polishing are recommended to meet higher academic writing standards. Particular attention should be given to ensuring accuracy and clarity in the use of technical terminology and complex sentence structures.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jiachen Zhang
Department, University & Country	Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, China