

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_122000
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Optimization of a Double-Layer Composite Pressure Vessel Structure
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript makes important new additions to the field of intelligent underwater equipment, especially when it comes to designing and improving pressure vessels made of composite materials. This study is useful for making better underwater systems because it focuses on lowering weight while keeping strength and stability. The study gives useful theoretical and practical insights to the scientific community. These insights are supported by simulations and real-world tests.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is correct because it makes it clear that the paper is about designing and improving a composite pressure tank structure.	
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 covers a lot of ground, but it could use more detailed information about how the experiments were validated. I think you should briefly talk about the hydrostatic tests that were done and the results to show how useful the study is in real life.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is well-organized, with sections that are easy to understand and follow as they study.	
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 article is strong from a scientific and a technical point of view. The results of the experiments and the use of finite element analysis (FEA) to validate the design give strong support to the findings that were made. The research method is well-documented, and the results are shown in a way that makes sense. This makes the results reliable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, and they talk about new trends in the field. Adding more current studies on composite materials used underwater, on the other hand, might make the literature review even better.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear and appropriate for academic writing, but there are a few places where the spelling and wording could be better. To fix small language problems, you should do a full proofreading.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-written and talks about an important subject in the creation of underwater equipment. The manuscript is more valuable because it includes both academic analysis and real-world validation. In general, it's a good piece of work.	

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:	Madhu P
Department, University & Country	Malnad College of Engineering, India