

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127641
Title of the Manuscript:	Analytic Determination of the Roller Length of a Hydraulic Jump in an Open Channel Flow using a Bouncing Ball
Type of the 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>

#### 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 article with the topic " Analytic Determination of the Roller Length of a Hydraulic Jump in an Open Channel Flow using a Bouncing Ball" has a very interesting topic, but it has many scientific and writing errors. The errors that exist are very obvious and the authors have not observed even some of the smallest rules related to writing an article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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 of the article is unfortunately not comprehensive and needs editing.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The text of the article needs a lot of revision.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The resources provided are relatively old and need to be updated.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English grammar and literature need a minor revision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Unfortunately, in this mode, this article cannot be accepted. However, in line with the errors of the article, a few comments are provided below to correct it:</p> <p>The article with the topic " Analytic Determination of the Roller Length of a Hydraulic Jump in an Open Channel Flow using a Bouncing Ball" has a very interesting topic, but it has many scientific and writing errors. The errors that exist are very obvious and the authors have not observed even some of the smallest rules related to writing an article. Unfortunately, in this mode, this article cannot be accepted. However, in line with the errors of the article, a few comments are provided below to correct it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- In the abstract section, present the results in quantitative form.</li> <li>2- In the introduction section, avoid presenting very old articles.</li> <li>3- In the introduction section, where subsections 1.1, 1.2, etc. introduce the types of hydraulic jumps, it is necessary to say that these subsections should be transferred to the materials and methods section.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>4- I can say that the introduction section is a very poorly written literature review and you have almost introduced the types of hydraulic presses, which should be included in another section. In this section, only a few articles, which are also from very old years, for example, 1959, 1972, etc., are presented.</p> <p>5- The end of the introduction section, where you should have presented the innovation of your research, lacks innovation.</p> <p>6- Divide the main sections of the article into abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion, and write the other sections as subsections.</p> <p>7- There are basic writing and grammatical errors in the English language throughout the text of the article that need to be corrected.</p> <p>8- In section experimental configuration, you must provide a real image of your laboratory model. It is also mandatory to provide images of measuring instruments such as depth gauges, etc.</p> <p>9- The quality of Figure 1 is low. Increase its clarity.</p> <p>10- Use software Mathtype to write equations.</p> <p>11- Using several evaluation parameters such as R2 (Correlation of determination), RMSE (Root mean square error), KGE (Kling-Gupta), etc. is very necessary and essential to evaluate the results of experimental and analytical data. Nowhere in the article, neither on the figure nor in the text of the article, is any analysis of comparing the results with each other given, and the results are only in the form of a report.</p>	
--	---	--

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ehsan Aminvash
Department, University & Country	University of Tabriz, Iran