



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_50396
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND TESTING OF AN INTELLIGENT DEVICE FOR COATING FLAWS AND CRACK DETECTION IN PIPELINES
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments Abstact Introduction Results	<p><b>Abstract requires reconstruction to eliminate grammar and render it comprehensible</b></p> <p><b>The review is on non-destructive methods of detecting flaws/cracks however, it is not properly espoused. Should be re-written to make it readable.</b></p> <p><b>The results harbour too many repetitions on methodology. This may be addressed.</b></p>	The Abstract has been restructured and all grammatical errors have been addressed. The readability of the work has been espoused.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments Avoid standalone sentences. Grammar and spelling mistakes.	Some statements are not well coordinated with past and later sentences.  Mistakes of these nature should be addressed	All the statement have been coordinated using the right tenses
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A good job has been carried out, However the delivery/presentation begs for maximum attention.	The overall research delivery system has been improved.

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Not Available