

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_128499
Title of the Manuscript:	Induction Motor Voltage Variation And Fault Adaptation In Submarines
Type of the Article	Research

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a valuable study with strong potential in marine engineering. Addressing the comments above will enhance its clarity, depth, and practical impact, making it more suitable for publication.	
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 the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent Reference needs to be included	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally well-written but requires minor grammatical corrections and technical refinement in some sections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the background is thorough, it could focus more on gaps in existing literature regarding submarine-specific fault detection and adaptation systems 2. Provide more details on why the Daubechies wavelet (db4) was selected over other wavelets. Include a comparative justification based on its effectiveness for transient signals. 3. The results are detailed, but a statistical analysis of fault detection performance (e.g., sensitivity, specificity, or precision-recall) would add robustness. 4. Explain the choice of a 20% undervoltage variation for fault simulation. Could other fault magnitudes yield different outcomes? 5. Figures (e.g., Fig. 5, Fig. 6) are visually informative, but labels and legends could be enhanced for clarity (e.g., explicit time and amplitude scales). 6. Table 2 summarizes wavelet coefficients effectively. Consider adding a comparative analysis of detection times for different fault scenarios. 7. The references are appropriate but should include more recent publications 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Digvijay Bhimrao Kanase</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Dr. D. Y. Patil Institute of Technology, India</p>