

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_127166
Title of the Manuscript:	ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK BASED PERFORMANCE PREDICTION SYSTEM FOR SPARK IGNITION ENGINES
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: 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 manuscript, titled "ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK-BASED PERFORMANCE PREDICTION SYSTEM FOR SPARK IGNITION ENGINES," explores the application of artificial neural networks to predict and optimize the performance of spark ignition engines. The manuscript addresses a highly relevant topic, offering valuable insights into a current issue of significant importance to both academic research and practical applications.	
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.	The abstract should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect the problem discussed in the paper, particularly by emphasizing the novel aspects of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 manuscript should clearly highlight the research novelty and originality by addressing a specific gap in the field. To ensure the study unique contributions are evident, a brief mention of its novelty should also be included in the Abstract and Conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	None	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The wording in this work demonstrates moderate proficiency in English. However, I recommend that the authors conduct a comprehensive review of the language and style throughout the article.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Jonandes Dias da Silva
Department, University & Country	UPE-POLI, Brazil