

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_99987
Title of the Manuscript:	Design, Simulation and Optimization of PZT-5A Cantilever Piezoelectric Pressure Sensor
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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 Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The motivation on the study should be further emphasized, particularly; the main advantages of the results in the paper comparing with others should be clearly demonstrated. 2. English should be further improved, since the paper has some spelling and grammar errors. Also the paper has some editing problems. 3. The example section needs to be further expanded and including some remarks to show the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed method, compared with others. 4. Some remarks on Theorem 1 would be necessary and helpful.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Manlika Ratchagit
Department, University & Country	Maejo University, Thailand