

Review Form 3

Book Name:	ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND INNOVATIONS
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4097
Title of the Manuscript:	ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND INNOVATIONS
Type of the Article	Complete Book

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This Book’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/book-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 book is made up of a set of articles divided by subjects (chapters) - Each article in the book has an introduction, methodology, results and conclusion. - The book covers several subjects, such as Advanced Materials Engineering; Composite Material; Material Testing and Characterization; Renewable Materials Engineering; Corrosion and Surface Engineering; thermal engineering; Energy Engineering; Fluid Dynamics and Aerodynamics; Sustainable Energy Systems; Robotics Engineering; Automation and Artificial Intelligence in Engineering; Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering; Simulation and Computational Modeling; Advanced Manufacturing Techniques and 3D Printing; Building and Construction Materials; Environmental and Water Quality Engineering; Waste Management; Automotive Engineering; Engineering Innovations;	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	- No. Article proceedings	

Review Form 3

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.	Each article that makes up the book has an abstract. It is not possible to generalize	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In a brief analysis of the articles that make up the book, it is not possible to verify any error. A more in-depth review is necessary as there are many articles.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Each article has its bibliographical references, some with sufficient quantities, others not.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The book needs to be formatted in general, taking into account several aspects, such as figures and tables without explanations and illegible, magnitude of variables, formatting of equations and definition of variables, standardization of bibliographic references... As described, some points observed: - Table 2 page 11 without data. - Figures with low resolution and illegible: Fig 1 and 2 page 17; Fig 1 page 18, Fig 2 page 19; Fig 1 page 24; , Fig 2 page 30; Fig 1 page 32; Fig 4 page 45; Fig 1 to 6 page 47; In general, there are many figures without sufficient resolution for reading and also poorly positioned in the text. A good review is needed to improve the figures. - There are many figures that are not being called throughout the text of the respective article and not explained so that they can be understood. - Many equations have formatting errors with special symbols such as #\$\$@”... Also many variables in the equations are not defined and do not show their respective units of measurement. - Equations in several articles are not numbered. - Bibliographic references do not comply with ABNT standards and are not standardized. They are not being cited throughout the text. - The number of decimal places of measured variables should not be in accordance with the measurement uncertainty of the equipment used for measurement, with more decimal places than necessary to determine the magnitude of the variable. (Ex: Angle of the cylindrical = 53.0646) - There are many poorly formatted tables with low resolution to be understood.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the 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 detail)</i> No	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	It is considered that the articles have been published in some conference and were not found in a quick web search.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5)

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from book editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.

Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.

Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.

Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.

Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	André Felipe Vieira da Cunha
Department of Reviewer	Professor and Researcher
University or Institution of Reviewer	Nuclear Energy Department (DEN) / Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE)
Country of Reviewer	Brazil
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Professor and Researcher
Email ID of Reviewer	andre.fvcunha@ufpe.br
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+55 81 9 9768-5386
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Solar Energy; Thermal Science; thermodynamics; Heat transfer