

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_88060
Title of the Manuscript:	Fuzzy equalization strategy based on multilayer circuits
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Substantially, the abstract is quite good but has not adopted the research objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Please explain the meaning of the sentence "the fuzzy equalization technique suggested in this work is able to confine the operational current <i>of the band you eat</i> within the normal range, making the equalization process safer.In the abstract section, it has been stated that "In comparison to a multilayer equalization circuit without an equalization strategy, the fuzzy equalization technique suggested in this work is able to confine the operational current of the band you eat within the normal range, making the equalization process safer. Therefore, it is also necessary to be stated in part 3 and reviewed in the results, this is important to strengthen validation.In section 4 SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION "Matlab is used to create the simulation platform in this paper", therefore it needs to be included in the literature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. A typo due to carelessness has been corrected.Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised. We have revised the abstract and analyzed the results, which can be found in Section 4.3We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have added literature.
Optional/General comments	Overall, this paper is good enough but needs some improvement as suggested above	We have made revisions in accordance with the reviewer's comments, and we hope our revisions satisfy you.

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)	There are no ethical issues with this manuscript.