Iwan Setiawan <iwansetiawan@live.undip.ac.id>

[IREE] Editor Decision
1 message

Editorial Staff <editorialstaff@praiseworthyprize.org>   Tue, Apr 3, 2018 at 6:50 PM
To: iwansetiawan@live.undip.ac.id

Dear dr. Iwan Setiawan:

We have reached a decision regarding your paper ID 14538: "Hard Real Time Software Design for Three Phase SPWM Generation Systems by using Fixed Point Arithmetic Computation in Low Cost 16 Bit DSC dsPIC30f4011", submitted to: International Review of Electrical Engineering (IREE). We apologize for the lengthy review period.

The paper has been accepted with minor revisions.

You should change the paper according to the remarks of the reviewers included at the foot of this email, then you should re-submit the revised paper by our on-line submission system, selecting the cited paper and uploading the Author Version in the section "Editor Decision".
The new text and the modifications introduced for answering the remarks of the reviewers should be indicated in red colour.

Sincerely,
Dr. Santolo Meo, Editor-in-Chief of International Review of Electrical Engineering (IREE)
santolo.meo@unina.it

Remarks of the Reviewers:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Accepted as it is.
Comments:
The paper is interesting and well structured. I suggest the acceptance.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accepted with minor revisions.
Comments:
1
English grammar needs to be corrected.

2
In the conclusion section you should indicate also which are the limits of your analysis. Where is the border?
In the conclusion section you should indicate also which are the limits of your proposed approach. Where are the borders and the weak points?

3
At the beginning of the paper, before the Introduction section, a nomenclature section, not numbered, should be added with a list, in alphabetic order, of all the used symbols and their meaning.

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Accepted with minor revisions.
Comments:
1
The English needs editing for grammatical errors and style. We suggest to use our service "English Language Editing". More information can be found to http://www.praiseworthyprize.com/english_service.htm

2
The section IV should be more extended.

3
The conclusions are extremely weak.

For any questions don't hesitate to contact us.
Best regards,
Editorial Staff
Praise Worthy Prize
Publishing House
editorialstaff@praiseworthyprize.org
_____

PRAISE WORTHY PRIZE

PUBLISHING HOUSE
Editorial Staff
editorialstaff@praiseworthyprize.com

Dear Reviewer

We would like to thank you for your valuable comments that helped us to improve our paper. Please find below our detailed reply to your comments.

Sincerely yours,

Iwan Setiawan et al.

Comments of Reviewer #1

```
Recommendation: Accepted as it is.


Comments:
The paper is interesting and well structured. I suggest the
acceptance.
```

Authors' Response:

Thank you very much for your compliment

Comments of Reviewer #2

```
Recommendation: Accepted with minor revisions.
Comments:
1 English grammar needs to be corrected.
```

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your useful suggestion on the Grammar of our manuscript. We have rechecked the manuscript carefully and tried to avoid any grammar error. However, in case our English still need to improved, we decide to purchase the english editing service offered by http://www.praiseworthyprize.com/english_service.htm

```
2. In the conclusion section you should indicate also which are
the limits of your analysis. Where is the border?
In the conclusion section you should indicate also which are the
limits of your proposed approach. Where are the borders and the
weak points?
```

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have revised conclusion and added the limit of our experiment result. Please see our revised conclusion section

Manuscript ID 14538
Paper Title : Hard Real Time Software Design for Three Phase SPWM Generation Systems by
using Fixed Point Arithmatic Computation in Low Cost 16 Bit DSC dsPIC30f4011

```
3. At the beginning of the paper, before the Introduction section,
a nomenclature section, not numbered, should be added with a list,
in alphabetic order, of all the used symbols and their meaning.
```

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your reminder. In the revised manuscript, We have added a nomenclature that placed right before Introduction Section. Please see our revised manuscript

Comments of Reviewer #3

Recommendation: Accepted with minor revisions.
Comments:
1. The English needs editing for grammatical errors and style. We suggest to use our service "English Language Editing". More information can be found to
http://www.praiseworthyprize.com/english_service.htm

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your useful suggestion on the Grammar of our manuscript. We have rechecked the manuscript carefully and tried to avoid any grammar error. However, in case our English still need to improved, we decide to purchase the english editing service offered by
http://www.praiseworthyprize.com/english_service.htm

2.The section IV should be more extended.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have add experiment results and theirs analysis. Please see our revised section IV.
.
3. The conclusions are extremely weak.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have revised conclusion. Please see our revised conclusion section