

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_120046</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Simulation and analysis of the dynamics of 2K-V gearbox based on RecurDyn</b>
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://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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study describes the dynamics of 2K-V gearbox based on RecurDyn by Simulation and analysis and may be useful to those interested in gearbox designs. This study may also have certain guiding significance for the precise design of the 2K-V reducer.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, Although it is too brief.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, See comments in the last row.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	See comments in the last row.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are few and not some indicated in the text. Moreover, it does not contain references for the last 5 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction is very brief and does not qualify as a research article. Also, the introduction needs to be considered and written about previous relevant studies, then a statement of the novelty of the research.</li> <li>- All figures and tables must be referenced in the text. Moreover, replace the language used in Figure 1 to define the parts with English.</li> <li>- In Section 2, remove the phrase "the modeling results." This is just a 3D drawing of gears, not results.</li> <li>- On what basis were the values listed in Table 1 adopted? The same applies to the values in subsection 3.2.</li> <li>- Even if the results are modeled in RecurDyn, it is necessary to include a mathematical model or governing equations.</li> <li>- Use a dark black color for the figures in the results section.</li> <li>- Some results and curves require deeper interpretation.</li> <li>- Furthermore, write "Relative error= (theoretical calculated value - simulation calculated value) / theoretical calculated value." in equation form.</li> <li>- The conclusion section is weak. It is preferable to provide quantitative conclusions as well as the most important directions for future studies.</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saif Ali Kadhim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Technology, Iraq</b>