



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_48482
Title of the Manuscript:	Nonlinear goal programming model Study for Hypotheses tests in Quality Control
Type of the Article	Method 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The subject of the paper looks interesting and suitable for JERR. Overall, the paper has been fairly organized and presented. However, the paper needs a major revision and development before it can be accepted for publication in JERR.</p> <p>The following comments need to be considered for the publication of the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title reflects the contents of the paper. 2. The abstract of the paper reads well. 3. The introduction section of the paper has been poorly organized and presented. 4. "Application study" section should be developed further in order to motivate the readers in the subject and demonstrate the currency of the subject. <p>It should include latest journal references and corresponding extracts from others case study order to highlight currency and relevance of the research subject and scope.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The paper lack of sufficient literature!! 6. The language of the paper needs a careful editing for the international readership. 	<p>Thank you for your précised review work</p> <p>We have tried to incorporate all the suggestion in the revised manuscript</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>Language has been corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	