

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Manuscript is about the optimization of a cycloidal pin, it is important in the scientific community.</b> <b>Finding of the study can be applied to entire cycloidal pin optimization process.</b>  <b>Another title for this research could be "Parametric design of cycloidal pin wheel reducer for robot transmission mechanism on solidWorks."</b>  <b>Yes it is.</b>  <b>Subsections and structure are coordinating with one another, but it will be nice if researchers describe the code.</b>  <b>Manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>  <b>References are relevant to the manuscript.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It will be nice if the article is written in the past tense or passive voice. Researchers are requested to the change the sentence starting as need such as you need, you can start etc.,.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Krishna Prasad Shrestha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kathmandu University, Nepal</b>