



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_9905
Title of the Manuscript:	A Proposed Modified Constant Frequency Variable Duty PWM Based Speed Control Technique for DC Motor Drives: A New Method to Achieve More Precise Control over Speed
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:

(<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	1. The abstract is not completed: the abstract tells the reader: WHAT you did, WHY you did it, HOW you did it, WHAT you found, and WHAT it means (Ref: http://www.outreach.psu.edu/programs/jr-science-humanities/abstract-writing.html). 2. The methodology is presented in a adequate technical language (there are many unnumbered equation in the text). 3. I recommend in un unitary way the description of the figures (Simple or Bold). 4. I recommend the restoration of the figures 5 and 6 because of the quality. 5. The conclusions are too short, and don't contain a comparative analysis of the theoretical and experimental results.	1. The abstract of the revised paper have been thoroughly modified in accordance with the reviewer's suggestion. 2. The methodology (Section "Theory") have been revised and made adequate by improving its technical representation. Some unnumbered equations in the aforesaid section have been separated from the text and numbered accordingly. 3. The descriptions of the figures (Fig. 1 – Fig. 9) have been made uniform by converting all of them bold. 4. Figures 5 and 6 have been regenerated to get the better quality of those. 5. Adequate quantitative discussions have been added to the conclusion section of the revised paper. Also the necessary comparisons between the theoretical and experimental results have also been added.
Optional/General comments	Article should be revised according to the comments above.	The article has been thoroughly revised in accordance with the reviewer's comments.