

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_97084
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on Parametric Design Technology of cycloidal pin wheel Reducer for Robot based on SolidWorks
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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important to scientific community. It focused on parametric design via VB.net language and SolidWorks.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive. The problem statement, results and conclusion should be added to buff up the abstract. The manuscript structure is fairly okay</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are current but more need to be added</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author should check for few incomplete sentences. Also, most sentences are joined together, the author should separate them	
Optional/General comments	1. Equation 2.1 should read equation 1 2. Figure 5 did not contain anything, author should review 3. Author should relate figure 6 to robotics 4. Alignment: justify subsection "conclusion"	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jude Ezechi Dara
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria