

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

MR6ESF

Brahim Ben Fathallah¹

¹ University of Tunis El Manar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review-Form

General Information about This Paper:

Paper ID: **Qeios ID: MR6ESF**

Paper Title: **Optimized Material Removal and Tool Wear Rates in Milling API 5ST TS-90 Alloy: AI-Driven Optimization and Modelling with ANN, ANFIS, and RSM**

Review Period: Three Weeks

Paper Quality: Mark your evaluation in the suitable column. 5 indicates the best and 1 implies the worst.

ASPECT	BEST	5	4	3	2	1	WORST
Scope	Relevant				Ö		Irrelevant
Organization:	Excellent				Ö		Poor
Clarity:	High			Ö			Low
Length:	Too Short				Ö		Too Long
References:	Adequate			Ö			Incomplete
Correctness:	Correct				Ö		Incorrect
Significance:	High			Ö			Low
Originality:	High				Ö		Low
Attachments:	Helpful			Ö			Unnecessary
If Survey Coverage:	Broad		Ö				Shallow
Contribution:	Significant			Ö			No new
Expression	Clearly				Ö		Vague
Grammar	Good			Ö			Poor

Please make very detailed technical and editorial comments and suggestions directly on the manuscript. Your comments are an invaluable aid to the author(s) to help in improving the overall technical quality, utility, and readability of the material. Particular attention should be given to details that guide possible revisions, or that clearly explain reasons for rejection. Please summarize comments that appear on the manuscript to help the author(s) focus on the major issues you have raised in your review.

What are the contributions of this paper?

The manuscript entitled "Optimized Material Removal and Tool Wear Rates in Milling API 5ST TS-90 Alloy: AI-Driven Optimization and Modelling with ANN, ANFIS, and RSM" has the proper structure and literature and is written regarding the language.

Recommendation (C)

A. Accept	
A. Revise and Accept (Major Revision)	
A. Major Revision	Ö
A. Reject	

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editor-in-Chief

The focus of this study is on modelling and simulation, not optimization. ANN, ANFIS, etc. are used to simulate a process with exact results, but we are not sure if they are optimal. The results obtained cannot be described as optimal and are just the final response of the modeling.

I accept this article with the major correction.

Comments to the Author(s)

Revision suggestions:

Specific comments and suggestions (on layout and format, title, abstract, introduction, method, statistical errors, results, conclusion/discussion, language and references) will be greatly appreciated. **If the paper needs professional English editing, kindly give some examples for reference.**

Detail revision suggestions:

- Revise the major paragraph and resume in the abstract.
- Keywords: rewrite using the abbreviation form
- In the introduction: Resume the process and either replace or delete and added other references exp: and: DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15282/jmes.15.4.2021.06.0673>
- In the paragraph 2.0: Insert the tool specification, delete this irrelevant table 3.

What criteria, tab, or method did you use to select 20exp? Table 5: insert in this paragraph.

Is it possible to create a tab for levels and cutting conditions values?

View this project, which helps you to develop:

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15282/jmes.15.4.2021.06.0673>

- Figure 1 is not required
- See the pdf paper
- In conclusion section : Rewrite the paragraph by using points.

The paper as a whole is about to be published. It is almost devoid of innovation or a new achievement. Whatever They have published is classic. To improve, go back to paragraphs to revised.

The conclusion needs more precision and innovation (for example: add a scientific or physical description).



Correct the comments mentioned in the paper.

Name: Brahim Ben Fathallah

Date: October 29, 2023

Signature:

Thank you very much for your contribution