

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JERR_101821 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Performance Evaluation of Networks using Gain Scheduling PID Networked Control System for Nonlinear Systems |
| 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A bit 2. Is suitable 3. Abstract is O.K. 4. A bit 5. Yes 6. Reference is O.K. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English quality is O.K. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide evidence of Application Software design and specification approach. 2. The work need provide what the remarkable achievement for the software design application with the conventional applications. 3. The theoretical analysis of experiment is not enough. 4. English grammar and spelling needs to be further checked. | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Tony Tsang |
| Department, University & Country | Hong Kong College of Technology, Sunderland University, China |