

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_130496
Title of the Manuscript:	A Pedagogical Model for Enhancing Mechanical Engineering Education Through Experimental Learning and Laboratory Techniques.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 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/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	Mechanical engineering education faces the challenge of providing students with practical, hands-on experiences that bridge the gap between theoretical concepts and real-world applications. This paper presents a pedagogical model designed to enhance mechanical engineering education through experimental learning and laboratory techniques. The model integrates theoretical instruction with interactive, real-world experiments that engage students in problem-solving and critical thinking, enabling them to apply engineering principles in practical settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and they are ok.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is Ok.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is Ok. And accepted for publishing	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emin Taner Elmas
Department, University & Country	Turkey