

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 contribution to knowledge is appropriate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title of the article suitable.	
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 as a description of paper is appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsection and structure is appropriate.	
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.	Contribution academic debate is appropriate. Research/study methods is appropriate. The Discussion and conclusion is appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference list Sufficient and properly referenced.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The standard of English is very good.	
Optional/General comments	Fit to the scope of the journal. Relevant and clarity of drawing graphs and tables is appropriate. The abstract as a description of paper is appropriate. The number of keywords is appropriate.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sampan Rittidech
Department, University & Country	Maharakham Univesrsity, Thailand