

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_124529
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Adaptive Position Control of Electrohydraulic Servo Systems with Parameter Uncertainty using Artificial Bee Colony Optimization Algorithm</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article: Ms_ARJOM_124529</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	The Manuscript (MS) is important as authors tried to explore 'optimal value selection' for EHSS system using non-traditional optimization algorithm ABC. Through the point of scientist community, its importance lies in 'performance improvement' of electro-mechanical systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title of MS is suitable. However, the title must be: Performance enhancement of Adaptive Position Control for Electrohydraulic Servo System with Artificial Bee Colony algorithm.	
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.	Authors needs to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brief explanation of limitations of classical control strategies to EHSS.</li> <li>2. Needs to revisit Abstract.</li> <li>3. Explanation of 'how controller ensures boundedness error &amp; control signal'?</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sections & subsections are presented appropriately.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Many typographical errors in the Manuscript especially in introduction section. So many 'Commas' are used unnecessarily. Authors need to double-check these errors.</li> <li>2. Also, references are randomly placed while in organization of paper authors have written romans I, II... but, in the manuscript they mentioned 1, 2,....</li> <li>3. For Eqs. 1-28, references are not mentioned. Question is if authors have developed theses equations?</li> <li>4. In Eq. (28), weight sum is always 1. However, they considered weightage 1 to all coefficients which is highly unacceptable.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Some recent references have to explore/add. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Global optimization of second-order sliding mode control parameters with a new sliding surface: an experimental verification to process control system, 2022. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isatra.2021.08.019">https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.isatra.2021.08.019</a>.</li> <li>2. Evolutionary optimization of sliding mode control for level control system, 2018. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isatra.2018.08.011">https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.isatra.2018.08.011</a>.</li> <li>3. Experimental realization of constrained optimization of sliding mode controller parameters with modified objective function, 2020. <a href="https://doi.org/10.37628/ijosct.v6i1.594">https:// doi.org/10.37628/ijosct.v6i1.594</a>.</li> </ol>	

**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>Authors needs to correct grammar, Typographical errors and other errors throughout the Manuscript.                  Ex: 1. In introduction section, paragraph 2, reference is cited as [2], which must be [2]                  2. Many errors like much commas before reference [8], reference [13] is missing &amp; randomly references are quoted in introduction section.                  3. In Eq. (1), what <math>k_1</math> &amp; <math>k_2</math> ?                  4. Authors have written Fig.. &amp; somewhere written Figure... No common strategy has been adopted by them.                  5. For each equation, authors did not cited references. It seems that if authors have developed the equations.                  6. How random numbers are generated? Authors must discuss the same.                  7. In Table 2, first 2 rows are with equal figures. It seems that the results are manipulated.                  8. From Figures 5 &amp; 7, it can be seen that SMC performance better than other reported strategies.                  9. Also, authors have taken input command signal <math>r(t)</math> as 0.2 &amp; 0.3. Not much difference will not be observed in the performance of a EHSS system.                  10. Under conclusion section, authors need to explore % improvement evaluated for proposed strategy over other.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><b>Acceptable with Serious Major revision</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><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>
<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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ajit R. Laware</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Savitribai Phule Pune University, Dr. VithalraoVikhe Patil College of Engineering, India</b></p>