

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130695
Title of the Manuscript:	Well-to-wheel efficiency analysis for mild hybrid vehicles
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title is not suitable Change name of the hybrid vehicle efficiency and performance of the wheel	Changed to mild hybrid electric vehicle and added energy consumption analysis to title
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.	Abstract is good no changes	No Changes
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Is good but no simulation data results and block diagram	Added flow charts for energy flow
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Take latest references ,2021 references is mentioned	Added latest references (highlighted)
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good communication	No Changes
Optional/General comments	Good paper	No Changes

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>	