

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

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, It requires further explanation of the outputs and suggestions regarding their usefulness for other cities and countries. 2. No, it should be more specific. 3. No, it should add brief outputs and suggestions. 4. Yes 5. Yes, but it requires further explanation. 6. The Highway Capacity Manual must be reviewed, and other related research that studied the use of VISSIM to model road crossings should also be reviewed. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It should be checked, particularly for punctuation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title should be more specific. 2. Abstract should add brief outputs and suggestions. 3. The introduction should start by highlighting common problems in the scientific community, explaining why they are worth studying. It will then introduce the choice of the Bandung City crossing as a case study. 4. Some parts in the theoretical review that are not directly related to the study can be removed or shortened. 5. Check Equation 1, and explanation. 6. Check List 1. Kapasitas Dasar Jalan Perkotaan (Co), page 5, and explanation what are the road types, the unit of SMP/hour, and other abbreviations which are not matched with English. 7. Tables 2-6 should be explained clearly for those who are not familiar with the roads in Indonesia. 8. Check language in Figure 1 Flow Diagram Study 9. Tables 8-9 should be explained. 10. Figures 3-4 should be explained. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>11. The explanation of results, justifications, and discussions must be significantly improved.</p> <p>12. The Conclusions requires further explanation of the outputs and suggestions regarding their usefulness for other cities and countries, as well as addressing limitations (e.g. the effects of using student-licensed program on the outputs).</p> <p>13. Check the references (some referred in the paper are not included)</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sittha Jaensirisak
Department, University & Country	Ubon Ratchathani University, Thailand