

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JERR_118899 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Structure design and analysis of welding robot manipulator |
| Type of the Article | |

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>The paper lacks clarity and is predominantly descriptive. It does not introduce any innovative contributions.</p> <p>Partially Correct, but the analysis doesn't have any graphs or plots. Alternate Tile for this Paper: "Understanding Articulated Manipulator for Welding Application"</p> <p>Abstract doesn't explain anything. The language used is very poor.</p> <p>Partially</p> <p>Can't be judged due to inadequate information</p> <p>Sufficient</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Not at all, sentences are poorly framed.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The paper lacks essential details, containing superfluous information that may already be familiar to readers. It lacks proper equations, graphs, controller names, and explanations of control algorithms. The design components are not scientifically detailed. A robotic paper should include rigorous equations. Mentioning the diameter formula is unnecessary for a scientific paper. There is a need to revise the paper to provide substantial content rather than merely defining each subsection. Overall, the paper appears more suited for school students rather than researchers</p> | |

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: | Khaja Ahmed Shaik |
| Department, University & Country | University of New South Wales, Australia |