

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_95958
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Coil-Induction, Foil-Capacity and growth in Pot Plant Batteries
Type of the 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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1.Is the manuscript important for scientific community? The paper presents an interesting proposal for research into energy generation. However, authors must include experimental results in the paper, and compare with numerical results. 2.Is the title of the article suitable? Yes! 3.Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes! 4.Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes! 5.Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes! 6.Are the references sufficient and recent? Yes! If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No!	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Angelo Marcelo Tusset
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Brazil