

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_124395
Title of the Manuscript:	Transcranial electrical stimulation as a neuromodulation method
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I felt is a good attempt by the authors. This article addresses the current advancements in neurostimulations. The author did the literature review effectively which situates the study within the broader context, highlighting the relevance of the research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I felt that the title is not reflecting the objective of this article. It may begin with Investigation/Exploration of TES to regulate Nervous system / Neurostimulation.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. If the author includes the statistical data if any relevant to the study will be better.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	May include Conclusion section after the results and discussion. The results discussion needs detailed analysis.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author highlighted the representation of how signal shape affects the outcomes of various electrostimulation techniques. The evidence-based review is grounded in a solid understanding of the current state of neurostimulation research. It provides the insights into the relationship between stimulation parameters and clinical outcomes, emphasizing the need for tailored approaches in treatment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Can include some more recent papers. Ex. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0006899323004134	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please mention the clear research objective in the Problem statement.2. Explain clearly how are you going to analyse/investigate the impact of the research work.3. When implementing this technique for electro acupuncture therapy, what are the physiological and psychological variables are considered and is the transformation in these variables due to the research work is not mentioned clearly.4. Data Analysis to support the research work needs improvement.5. Need to mention, how the control or selection of the signal parameters are carried out based on different persons undergoing treatment.6. The author may include a comparatively analysis of the three methodologies mentioned in the conclusion part to augment their findings.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	G. Janaki
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India