

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_117377
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical Comparison of Cu and Al₂O₃ Nanoparticles in a Water-based Nanofluid
Type of the 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>Yes</p> <p>The title of the study is quite general. I recommend changing it to a more specific title that reflects the work. There may be a paper title to contain the magnetic field.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It seems that one author is cited too many times in the references section. I don't find this appropriate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are spelling errors in the paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All symbols must be added to Nomenclature. • All equations must be numbered separately. • Keywords should be chosen appropriately for the study. In the study, the effects of each nanoparticle was examined separately, a hybrid nanofluid (ternary nanofluid) was not studied. • The geometry of the work should be explained. • Study not validated by previous studies. • Concrete results obtained should also be shared in the conclusion section. 	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Selma Akçay
Department, University & Country	Çankırı Karatekin University, Türkiye