

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.	While to machine learning approach chosen in this work is of value to the scientific community, its implementation was not robust. The mathematical relations/algorithms associated this ML technique was completely absent in this work. It was simply a black-box type of implementation. The choice of data partitioning ratio, error analysis etc. was not properly presented. The paper reads like a student term-paper rather than an original journal manuscript.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract lacks any quantitative information. Things like prediction accuracy ranges, errors etc. should be included. 2. Machine learning can be heavily statistical and so it is important to show that its use preserves the physics or is representative of the phenomena. 3. Your conclusion on the performance of 'bagging ensemble' relative to XX is too vague. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is hard to say, considering to physics was presented. Only ML prediction of a very limited data was presented. Perhaps, testing the data on other data or adding more physical context to the discussion would add value to the paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are grossly insufficient. Consider adding the following to the ANN part if you find them relevant. a. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtice.2017.02.005 b. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinma.2019.100012	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are too many typos and font inconsistencies.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 1 paragraph 2: This should be the first paragraph and should clearly identify where Ensemble ML was applied and where ANN/etc. was applied. 2. Page 4 paragraph 1: what version of Python? Discuss the validity and source of your data (preferably in a separate section). State how you arrived at your data partitioning ratio. 3. Page 4, las paragraph: Inadequate citations in section 2.1 (BST) and none in section 2.2 (ANN). Consider adding the following to the ANN part if you find them relevant. a. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtice.2017.02.005 b. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinma.2019.100012 4. Section 3.0. No dept in discussion of result. The results, as presented, have little value to the scientific community. 	

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:	Paul O. Ayegba
Department, University & Country	California State University, USA