

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_91186
Title of the Manuscript:	Stabilization of Quadcopter using the Combination of LQR and SMC Methods
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page no 3, the equation number to be started with 7 instead of 12. Change the sequence accordingly 2. Page 5 , instead of Image 1, make it Fig.4 and change the numbering accordingly 3. Page 5 ,replace "The under-actuated subsystem in Fig . 2, "The under-actuated subsystem in Fig . 4, 4. Table-1 parameters shown reference paper is missing, similarly for table 2 and table 3 values 5. Page 9, Fig.12 blue and orange colour labelling should be vice versa. Currently blue colour represents low speed and orange represent high speed which is wrong 6. Fig.13, Y axis omega 4 and omega 1 to be typed instead of omega 7. Page 10, need to explain the cause and also remedy to the point - the controller follows the angles perfectly up to 75s but shows a poor performance for roll angles between 75s and 85.1 interval and 100s 110.2, causing system fluctuations 8. Page 11, Readytosky 920 KVA has to be replaced with Readytosky 920 KV 9. Page 13, the actual flight test produced very different results. This point has to be explained and details of actual results has to be displayed and compared, stating the percentage deviation from actual and the reason 10. In conclusion it was stated that "The voltages across the cells are too far apart, resulting in battery instability", This point was not explained in the paper and the voltages were not shown 11. The controller reduces the computational time and there was no supporting evidence or comparison with existing model computational time. This needs to be addressed 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madhu Palati
Department, University & Country	BMS Institute of Technology and Management, India