

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125035
Title of the Manuscript:	An Investigation on the Properties of Alkyd-Based Varnish Coated of Post-Microwave Treated Wood Exposed to Outdoor
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The title of research is relevant, because repeated application of a protective layer during the operation of a wooden product can represent the full cost of such a product. Therefore, it is worth developing measures to reduce the impact of the environment on the surface. The given results reflect the positive effect of microwave radiation on the adhesiveness in the varnish-wood system. It is important to expand the number of researched wood species and protective coatings. Having chosen effective parameters of the influence of microwave radiation for this purpose.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article corresponds to the methodology and results of the research	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and does not need improvement	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript corresponds to the accepted norms. It is worth summarizing the review and adding the purpose of this study. The conclusion needs to be expanded. In particular, add a general summary for each type of research. Please write possible future studies in this direction. I ask you to write possible future studies in this direction of research.	
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 authors observed the rules of scientific ethics, the correctness of references to literary sources. This article contains original solutions, detailed methodology and confirmation by the results obtained. However, the results in the form of tables are difficult to perceive visually. The content of the article is displayed in keywords, the results are described in detail.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I recommend to use references published after 2000. Many references to the works of one author (Sahin H.T.), it is worth looking for the results of other researchers.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English at a sufficient level of understanding.	
Optional/General comments	I recommend adding the purpose of the study. It is worth looking for more recent studies for analysis. The results in the form of tables should be presented as histograms (for example). Extending the conclusion will contribute to a better understanding of the results and future research.	

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:	Oleksandra Horbachova
Department, University & Country	University of Life & Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine