

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2827
Title of the Manuscript:	Adaptive Charging System for PEM Fuel Cells Using a 4-Switch Buck-Boost Converter
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Figures and Tables, Sensitivity Analysis, Comparison with Control Methods, Problem Statement Not Clearly Defined in Manuscript	
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.	<p><b>Not Clearly Discuss</b></p> <p>The literature review does not sufficiently cover recent research on control techniques for charging systems. Expand the discussion on state-of-the-art methods and highlight the paper's contribution more clearly.</p> <p>The paper lacks a concise and well-defined problem statement, making it difficult to understand the specific challenges the authors aim to address</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The mathematical formulations, especially for the PEM architecture, need more clarity and proper explanation. Some equations lack detailed derivation and explanation.</li> <li>2. Figures and tables are poorly organized. Some figures lack detailed captions, making them hard to interpret. Figures 20-28 are not discussed adequately in the text.</li> <li>3. The results, especially regarding power extraction from Battery PEM, are not thoroughly discussed. It's unclear how the proposed controllers perform under varying conditions like partial shading or low wind speeds.</li> <li>4. Improve the literature review by including recent works from the not more than past 3-5 years. Such as,</li> <li>5. Add a clear problem statement.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form2**

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes required	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No Comments	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ravi Bukya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malla Reddy College of Engineering and Technology, India</b>