

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_103225
Title of the Manuscript:	Probing for the Energy-conserving Load Rates of the Asynchronous Motor by Harnessing the Efficiency and Power Factor Synergy.
Type of the Article	Method 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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This work is significant as it aims to find the optimal operating regions for AC motors, considering efficiency and power factor.</p> <p>The title is fine, but it is suggested to rewrite the title to reduce ambiguity.</p> <p>Abstract can be written in one paragraph format, instead of giving many subtopics.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The references are relevant, but not recent. Most of the references can be replaced by recent articles published in reputed journals.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But the abstract and the introduction part can be organised in a better way.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Technically the paper is good. The experiments and the results are significant. The abstract and introduction part to be improved. Reference section to be updated with recent articles.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haneesh K. M
Department, University & Country	CHRIST University, India