

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_97074
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and research status of RV reducer
Type of the Article	A Review

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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. No. Possible alternative: ADVANCING THE FRONTIERS OF RV REDUCER AND DEVELOPMENT IN INDUSTRIAL ROBOTIC TECHNOLOGY Yes Yes Yes Do some reference update with very recent years	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1) In figure 1, diagram should be labelled for proper explanation. It should not be left floating. 2) Acronyms should be defined e.g RV & CNC -mean what? 3) Subheadings should be uniformly written (outline level 1) i.e Capitalize first letter in each key word. 4) Your references are not properly sited. Some mixed up. 5) Some names are mentioned as though it is historically referenced, but your way of presenting them shows that they are the researchers. Look into this and recast or present them appropriately as referenced. 6) the work was not properly concluded. Rework on your conclusion	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ikharo Abdullahi Braimoh
Department, University & Country	Edo State University, Nigeria