

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JERR_118284 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Review of Lifting Path Planning Algorithms for Intelligent Cranes |
| Type of the Article | Method Article |

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

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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. It looks a substantial manuscript for the science in its field. 2. The title of the article is appropriate to the content. 3. The abstract adequately covers the content of the article. 4. Objectives, methods and results are sufficiently objective. Tables and figures are understandable. Scientific interpretation and presentation are successful. 5. It is a research article appropriate to the purpose of the journal and scientifically satisfying. 6. The references presented in the bibliography are sufficient. <p>Thank you for your contribution to science.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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: | Mustafa Rasit Turgut |
| Department, University & Country | Marmara University, Turkey |