

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102848
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal configuration of reactive power in distribution network with power electronic transformer
Type of the 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes it is important for the scientific community. It brings to the fore a power electronic based transformer to be used for voltage stability and reactive power management in power distribution grids</p> <p>2. The article's title is a suitable one</p> <p>3. The abstract is of good quality and comprehensive</p> <p>4. Yes they are</p> <p>5. Yes it is. The concepts behind the power electronic transformer are all proven engineering concepts with well-established literature.</p> <p>6. The references are adequate and over 80 per cent are recent</p> <p>Introduction is adequate. The PET well introduced and the overall Background of the problem well-articulated together with the Problem Statement.</p> <p>However, the author(s) mentioned in the Abstract that he/she/they used an improved Wolf Pack Algorithm (WPA) – Feedback Wolf Pack Algorithm (FWPA). I want the author(s) to be categorical on the following:</p> <p>1. If so, clearly state so in your work (in the Abstract and Introduction)</p> <p>2. If it is not, then mention clearly the gap in literature that warranted the use of the readymade improved version of the WPA (in the Introduction)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language very appropriate.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise and elaborate discussion on the PET design and the role of the proposed Feedback Wolf Pack Algorithm (FWPA) in it <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good validation by objective comparison of proposed FWPA with the classical WPA and PSO Good graphical illustrations 	

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:	Obinna Emmanuel Ozoemena
Department, University & Country	University of Abuja, Nigeria