Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_125075**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Analysis of Direct and Soft Starting Method for Induction Motor on Difference Load Levels**
Type of the Article	The type of the article is a research paper.

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a detailed comparative analysis of direct and soft starting methods for induction motors, which are critical in various industrial applications. The use of MATLAB/Simulink for simulations adds to the rigor of the study, allowing for reproducibility and validation of results. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough investigation into a practical issue faced by engineers, showcasing how optimized starting methods can lead to improved efficiency and reduced mechanical wear. Such insights are invaluable for both academic researchers and industry practitioners looking to enhance motor performance and longevity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, the title **"Comparative Analysis of Direct and Soft Starting Method for Induction Motor on Different Load Levels"** is suitable. It clearly conveys the main focus of the manuscript, which is a comparative study of two starting methods for induction motors under various load conditions. However, if you are looking for an alternative title that could enhance clarity or interest, consider the following suggestion: **"Performance Comparison of Direct and Soft Starting Methods for Induction Motors Across Various Load Conditions"** This alternative title emphasizes the performance aspect and maintains the focus on the comparative nature of the study.	
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, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the key findings and methodology used in the study, providing a clear overview of the comparative analysis of direct and soft starting methods for induction motors. However, I suggest adding a brief statement about the practical implications of the findings, as this would enhance the relevance of the research for both academic and industry audiences. Additionally, a mention of the specific results or numerical outcomes could strengthen the abstract by providing concrete evidence of the benefits of the soft starting method.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization of the content facilitates the reading and understanding of the topics discussed, allowing readers to follow the logical flow of the study. Each section addresses key aspects of the research, from the introduction to the conclusion, reinforcing the clarity and focus of the work.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it presents a detailed analysis of two starting methods for induction motors using simulations in MATLAB/Simulink. The methodology is clear and well-founded, allowing for the replicability of results. Furthermore, it is based on well-established theoretical principles and provides quantitative data that support the claims made. The presentation of results in graphs and tables reinforces the validity of the conclusions, making the study of great value to the scientific community.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The manuscript includes a variety of relevant sources that support the concepts and findings presented in the study. The references are pertinent to the topic and provide a solid context for the research.	

Review Form 3

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript uses clear and precise technical language, which facilitates the understanding of the concepts and findings presented.	
Optional/General comments	**"Comparative Analysis of Direct and Soft Starting Method for Induction Motor on Different Load Levels"** The manuscript provides an insightful and comprehensive examination of the direct and soft starting methods for induction motors, making a valuable contribution to the field of electrical engineering. **(a) Title:** The title is clear and precise, effectively capturing the essence of the study. It immediately conveys to the reader the comparative nature of the research, which is critical for understanding its significance. **(b) Abstract:** The abstract successfully summarizes the main findings, emphasizing the effective use of MATLAB/Simulink for the comparative analysis. It succinctly highlights the benefits of the soft starting method, such as reduced transient times and inrush currents, which are essential for minimizing mechanical and electrical wear. This clarity aids readers in grasping the research's significance from the outset. **(c) Introduction:** The introduction effectively sets the stage for the research by contextualizing the importance of induction motors in industrial applications. It provides a strong foundation by summarizing relevant previous work and justifying the need for this study. The comprehensive literature review enhances the credibility of the manuscript and demonstrates the authors' commitment to thorough research. **(d) Materials and Methodology:** The methodology is robust and meticulously detailed. The choice of MATLAB/Simulink for simulating the starting methods ensures the precision and reproducibility of the results. By evaluating the performance across various load levels, the study presents a thorough assessment that adds depth to the analysis. The selection of a 35 kW induction motor and the careful description of the parameters used reinforce the technical soundness of the research. **(e) Results and Discussion:** Results are presented in a clear and organized manner, utilizing graphs and tables that facilitate easy comparisons between the starting methods. The manuscript convincingly demonstrates the advantages of the soft starting method, with well-founded discussions that articulate the practical implications for industrial applications. This depth of analysis not only highlights the relevance of the findings but also encourages further exploration in the field. **(f) Conclusion:** The conclusion is well-structured and effectively summarizes the key findings of the study. It strongly reinforces the superiority of the soft starting method in terms of efficiency and reduced mechanical and electrical stresses. This clear linkage between the results and their practical applications underscores the importance of advanced techniques in improving motor performance. **(g) Acknowledgements:** While acknowledgments are not explicitly mentioned, including this section would enhance the manuscript by recognizing any contributions or support received during the study. **(h) References:** The manuscript includes a well-curated selection of relevant and recent references, demonstrating a thorough review of the existing literature. This solid foundation enhances the research's credibility and situates it within the broader context of ongoing advancements in the field. Overall, this manuscript is a well-crafted and significant contribution to the scientific community, providing valuable insights that can inform both academic research and practical applications in the industry. I commend the authors for their thorough investigation and clarity in presentation. **No, there are no ethical issues identified in this manuscript.** The study focuses on the technical analysis of starting methods for induction motors and does not involve human subjects, animals, or sensitive data that could raise ethical concerns. Additionally, the methodology used is appropriate and adheres to established scientific standards. No, there are no competing interest issues identified in this manuscript. The study focuses on a technical analysis of starting methods for induction motors, and there are no indications that the	

	authors have any financial, professional, or personal ties that could influence the objectivity of the research. There is no suspicion of plagiarism in this manuscript. The content presented is original and well-documented with appropriate references. All claims and results are supported by a thorough review of the existing literature, which upholds the integrity of the work.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ibar Federico Anderson**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina**