

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_84753
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPROVEMENT OF THREE PHASE INDUCTION MOTOR PERFORMANCE USING VOLTAGE AND FREQUENCY SPEED CONTROL TECHNIQUES
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lot of grammatical mistakes are there throughout the paper, different font used in section 4.2 after equation (1.5) 2. In figure-2, role of TR2 is not mentioned 3. Section-3, methodology: TR1 rating is 315V/12V and in the same paragraph it is mentioned as TR1 is a step-down transformer, which steps down the main of 220V to 230v into 12V a.c., whereas in figure 3 the input voltage is 220V 4. Simulation has to be performed for 2-pole or 3-pole motor is not mentioned. Figure 6 and Figure 7 x-axis speeds are different. Similarly Figure 8 and Figure 9 speed are different 5. The simulation sequence was modelled and developed in Matlab using equation (3.38). Equation 3.38 is not there in the paper, the equation numbers are different in the paper 6. under results and discussions it is mentioned as "for a line frequency of 60Hz, the peak torque was observed at 42Nm while the corresponding rotor speed was 1614rpm", in 4 pole machine the speed cannot be reached beyond 1500 rpm on no-load and under loaded condition it can go beyond 1450 rpm 7. conclusion is not written well 8. validation of results is missing 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madhu Palati
Department, University & Country	BMS Institute of Technology and Management, India