SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_50764**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Performance response tests on a new MFR relay for AC microgrids**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	This paper presents the results of offline and online performance tests on a new multivariable fuzzy rule based (MFR) relay for ac microgrids. The relay is based on measurement of four critical parameters (P, Q, V and I) and fuzzy logic implementation of rules framed based on these parameters. The online test was performed by connecting the relay to a utility-microgrid testbed. The offline test was performed by simulating High, Normal and Low states of the critical parameters using proper combination of digital signal sources to implement short circuits (SCs) in SIMPOWER Systems®. In both offline and online tests, the faults simulated are standard SCs in the utility and microgrid. The results of both offline and online tests are similar and show that the MFR relay outputs logic 1 during SC faults. The relay also outputs logic 0 before and after the SC faults for both offline and online tests. In my opinion, the paper is well written and organized. The work of the paper is correct. However, there are some comments to improve the quality of the paper which are given as follows: • In the introduction part, the author should give more background works in details about advantages of the proposed method over the existing methods • Some remarks on the computation complexity of the obtained results should be given. • In Figures, further explanations should be provided about the different coordinate systems. Please make sure that the parameters in all figures are explained.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Grienggrai Rajchakit***
Department, University & Country	***Maejo University, Thailand***