

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_128677
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTING BUBBLE POINT PRESSURE AND GAS-OIL RATIO PVT PROPERTIES USING BAGGING ENSEMBLE TECHNIQUES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work presents the use of Bagging ensemble machine learning to predict the bubble point pressure and the gas-oil-ratio. The results are compared with the empirical correlations found in the literature and with the Artificial Neural Network. The authors show that the Bagging Ensemble predictions are more accurate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Requires improvements. Some sentences need to be reformulated. Punctuation is missing in some parts.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Is the training set the same as the testing data set? It was not clear</p> <p>Lines 27 – 30: the text is not clear, probably missing punctuation. Rephrase</p> <p>Lines 36 – 37: elaborate more. Instead of just citing those studies, explain what was done, the advances and challenges, and justify your work. Why are you doing this? Is this something that is missing in the literature? Why is this important?</p> <p>Lines 71 -72: review English</p> <p>Lines 105 – 106: This is the data set used for training (80 %) and for testing (20%)?</p> <p>Lines 106 – 107: Could you be more specific on what you mean by clean data to feed the algorithm?</p> <p>Figure 2 and 4 could be better if vectorized.</p> <p>Figure 2 and 4: basically, all cases have a bad prediction performance at approximately 1600. Could you provide comments on the text about that?</p> <p>Line 137: Fig 5 or Fig 4?</p> <p>Could you be more specific on the 'performance evaluation'?</p> <p>Results are poorly discussed. Tables parameters are not clearly presented and discussed.</p> <p>Punctuation is missing several times and different font in line 44.</p>	

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:	Luiz Henrique Meneghel Lino
Department, University & Country	France