

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_123710
Title of the Manuscript:	Research status and trend of three-dimensional force sensor
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of three-dimensional force sensors, highlighting their critical role in advancing fields like medical rehabilitation and aerospace. By detailing the various measuring principles and the latest advancements in elastomer design, it addresses the ongoing challenges of measurement accuracy and dimensional coupling errors. Furthermore, the prospective insights into the future development of these sensors offer valuable guidance for researchers and engineers aiming to enhance sensor technology in diverse applications.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a solid foundation, but it could benefit from a few enhancements for clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand on the development trends by specifying potential technological innovations or areas of research that could drive future advancements.</li> <li>• Consider specific metrics or results, if available, to support claims of high precision and wide measuring range.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Result and discussion part should be included to claim the superiority of proposed method</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive review of three-dimensional force sensors, grounded in established measurement principles such as resistance strain gauges, capacitive sensing, and piezoelectric effects. The inclusion of relevant studies and applications from reputable institutions lends credibility to its findings and highlights the practical significance of the discussed sensor technologies. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively addresses current challenges, such as dimensional coupling and measurement accuracy, while proposing innovative design solutions and future research directions. Overall, the systematic organization of information and the emphasis on empirical data reinforce the manuscript's reliability and relevance in the field of sensor technology.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript provide a solid foundation for the discussion of three-dimensional force sensors, covering various aspects such as design, application, and measurement principles. However, while the list includes some relevant and recent works, it could benefit from the inclusion of more contemporary studies, particularly those published in the last few years, to reflect the latest advancements in sensor technology and applications.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language quality of the manuscript is generally good, but there are areas where clarity, conciseness, and grammatical accuracy could be improved. Here are some observations:</p> <p>Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down into shorter, more manageable parts for better readability. Simplifying complex phrases will enhance understanding.</p> <p>Ensure consistent use of terms, especially when referring to sensor types (e.g., "three-dimensional force sensor" vs. "three-axis force sensor"). Consistency helps avoid confusion.</p> <p>Ensure that references to figures (e.g., "as shown in Figure 1") are placed appropriately in the text and are clearly linked to the content discussed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Based on the content provided, there are no specific competing interest issues explicitly mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>Based on the content provided, there are no explicit ethical issues evident in the manuscript itself.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Om Prakash Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sandip Institute of Technology and Research Centre, India</b>