

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_81417
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical analysis of an unsaturated capillary barrier cover system
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The article is well written and the subject is of great interest. If the corrections are implemented in their entirety, the same may be published. The abstract is poorly structured.</p> <p>If the authors do not correct as recommended the work cannot be published!</p> <p>Improve the literature review, with at least three more articles on the topic in other regions of the world.</p> <p>Describe the area of study a little better in the material and methods and the Numerical solution strategy.</p> <p>Why decreasing behavior was observed in an area close to the left and right boundary of the barrier? Describe it better in the text.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Redo the summary logically and sequentially: add a sentence that explains the importance of the type of study performed.</p> <p>A good summary of scientific work consists of (in the following order):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a sentence describing the importance of this type of study; - a sentence describing the objective(s) of the study; - one or two sentences describing material and methods; - one or two sentences describing the results and discussion and, finally, - a sentence describing the conclusion. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>There are citations outside the norms and cannot be published in this way In all references to the material on the internet put: Available at: < place the site >. Access on: 16 Jan. 2022. Leave hyperlinks active!</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Francisco Marcuzzo
Department, University & Country	Brazil