

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_122738
Title of the Manuscript:	High Efficiency Bidirectional Dual Active Bridge DC/DC Converter for level 3 Electric Vehicle Charging
Type of the Article	Applications of Power Electronics

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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A Bidirectional Dual Active Bridge DC/DC Converter is vital for improving the effectiveness, sustainability, and economic viability of electric cars. Its role in facilitating advanced energy management, ensuring grid stability, cutting emissions, and promoting technical innovation has far-reaching societal consequences, contributing to a cleaner, more resilient, and more equitable future.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	<div>1. Include abbreviation of PLECS.</div> <div>2. Experimental results are not included in the article. Either add experimental results or delete sentence "experimental result" from abstract.</div> <div>3. Fig. 3, Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 not cited in text.</div> <div>4. Provide good quality images for Fig. 5</div> <div>5. Include abbreviation of FET and MOSFET.</div> <div>6. Add table for parameter values of converter.</div>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Format the paper strictly according to the template available in the website.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Effective vehicle charging has become the main concern in recent times. The article's problem statement is related to current developments in electrical vehicle technology. The simulation results of the proposed converter demonstrated and explained with circuits diagrams.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient and not recent. Add more references to the reference section, preferably recent (2021,2022 and 2023).	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Asapu Siva
Department, University & Country	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for Women, India