

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting, but ideally a good title is one that has/shows: [a] topical substance, [b] research context, [c] describing research methods, [d] value & originality.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good and has been equipped with a. the purpose of the research conducted, b. The research method used, c. The main findings or results of the research, d. Originality and value of the research conducted, e. Implications of the studies conducted.</p> <p>4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are <i>good</i> enough and <i>appropriate</i>.</p> <p>5. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Method Article. Research objectives, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study and <i>Materials and Method</i>, significant findings and Method of validation, have all been well and clearly stated. The proposed methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Books, Conference Proceedings and minimal Journals.</p> <p>SPECIAL COMMENT This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Method Article. But, I'm not sure whether writing an Abstract like that has fulfilled the correct Abstract writing rules. Research objectives, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, <i>Materials and Method</i>, significant findings and Method of validation, have all been well and clearly stated. The Proposed methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>. I think the writing of keywords is good and correct. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by <i>Books, Conference Proceedings and minimal Journals</i>. I believe that the author has <i>adequate understanding and knowledge</i> of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Good enough	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Accept with Minor Revision	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Indonesia