



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_49706
Title of the Manuscript:	Modal analysis and optimization of typical parts of 2K-V reducer
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research work is ok and has matter to publish as research paper, however, it is NOT proofread (Sentence Framing is very poor). This correction should be done in the revised manuscript. 2. The presentation part is very poor and need to be improved a lot before publication 3. The paper is too lengthy to read and difficult to understand. Large amount of matter(About 60%) in the paper should be edited. It is reasonable if the paper contains some 8-10 pages without losing the content of the work. As per my knowledge, it is possible edit an make paper more beautiful to read. 4. As conclusion part is heart of the paper and hence the author is requested to improve the presentation style write the conclusion chapter point wise. 5. Description of 2K-V type reducer transmission principle is very poor and need refine a lot and the sentences framing are difficult understand. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Syntax errors are more and need to be corrected before publishing the paper to improve the standards of the journal (Lines 227 etc) 2. Author is requested follow the same style in references 3. Only limited number of references are quoted and requested to quote some more recent reference related work. 4. Author is suggested not use I, we, our etc in research papers (lines 84, 88, 99) 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author is requested quote the references for the Material Properties shown in chapter 3.2 2. Author is requested increase the clarity of screen shots of the results. letters of the screen shots are difficult to read 3. Table 2 framing is in-adequate 4. In Line 208, what is the meaning of Out? 5. In Conclusion chapter, The point 2 has to be corrected (line 281). 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Naga Bhushana Rao Vakada</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Raghu Institute Of Technology(A), Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, India</i>