



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_42321
Title of the Manuscript:	Regression Analysis based Effective Manpower Planning Methodology: A Case Study.
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<u>Introduction</u> The researcher(s) did not really do a proper literature review of earlier research efforts in this area. The works of Okoye (2007), Opoku-Mensah (2012), Igokwe-Ibeto, Osakede and Anazodo (2015)& Wajiga & Ndaghu (2017) among others can be reviewed. The introduction and the literature review can be merged together. The literature review can be inserted before paragraph 4 (which looked at the different methods) to focus on the different research efforts of other researchers. <u>Methodology</u> a) Who did you administered questionnaire to? How many (in figure) copies were administered? Who did you interviewed? How many people were interviewed? b) I believe equation should be written in roman figure e.g. $y_s = a + b x_s \quad (i)$ Equation (i) Equation (ii) Equation (iii) <u>Recommendation</u> The researcher(s) should have at least one or two recommendations for the university, particularly the department sampled, from the research. These recommendations can also help some other tertiary institutions.	<u>Introduction</u> Literature review has been updated. Parts of the added past works include some of the suggested past works. Thanks for the suggestion! Introduction and Literature review have also been restructured as appropriate. <u>Methodology</u> a. Data were obtained from the records section of the exams and records unit of the institution. This has been stated in the revision. b. Roman numeral has been adopted for equations numbering. <u>Recommendation</u> Based on findings of the work, appropriate recommendation has been suggested in the revision.
Minor REVISION comments	<u>Conclusion</u> The first sentence in the conclusion section is too long (5 lines), the researcher(s) can consider breaking it into two meaningful sentences.	<u>Conclusion</u> Conclusion has been updated. The sentence has been broken up as suggested. Thanks for the observation and suggestion!
Optional/General comments	Considering the discussion of the results, I strongly believe that the researcher(s) used secondary data. There is no discussion of data related to the questionnaire or interview.	A section for data collection has been added, and discussion of results updated appropriately.