

AUTHOR REVISION REPORT

Note: For comments/questions/Answers/Revisions, use the language according to the language used in the manuscript (English or Bahasa Indonesia).

I. Manuscript Identity

Title	Designing Air-Cored Axial Flux Permanent Magnet Generator with Double Rotor
Manuscript number	53048
Article Type	Research article / Review Article
First Submission date	2022-02-27
Recommendation on First Submission Manuscript	Reviewer 1 (RV1) : Major Revisions Reviewer 2 (RV2) : Minor Revisions
Revision Submission Date	2022-04-06

II. Reviewer's Comments**2.1. General Impression**

	Reviewers (R1 & R2)	Authors
	Comments/Questions	Comments/Answers/Revisions in the Manuscript
General comprehension of the manuscript		
Language/style/Grammar in general		
Structure		
Level of enthusiasm		

2.2. Revision on Major Comments

	Reviewers (R1 & R2)	Authors
	Major Comments	Answers/Revisions in the Manuscript
Abstract	[R1.1] (Reviewer 1, There is an abstract it explains most of the activities that have been carried out, but it does not explain the conclusions obtained from the analysis which have been done.)	[R1.1] (Reviewer 1, Thank you for your kind feedback. We had revised our abstract by adding explanations for our results and analysis as advised]
	[R1.2] (Reviewer 1, The information described in the abstract explains too much about the research object; it should also explain the method used.)	[R1.2] (Reviewer 1, We also had added the explanation of the method used in the study as advised]

Introduction	[R1.6] (Reviewer 1, The introductory section is well explained. It is recommended to add one or two more paragraphs to explain the development of the air-cored axial flux permanent magnet with double rotors and the improvements made that distinguish it from other air-cored axial flux permanent magnets with double rotors.)	[R1.2] (Reviewer 1, we had added a paragraph in the intro related to the development and improvement from related previous study]
Methodology	<p>[R1.10] (Reviewer 1, This section is hoped to clarify or add the research method used. If carrying out experimental activities, show the experimental setup/setup apparatus and measuring tools used for measurement activities.)</p> <p>[R1.11] (Reviewer 1, If this manuscript focuses on design activities, the design methodology should be explained comprehensively and more comprehensively. The methodology used does not match the title of this manuscript.)</p> <p>[R2.1] (Reviewer 2, - There is a misapprehension of the equation - Pay attention to the period and comma for writing in English - Delete this unit of T(Tesla) view attachments])</p>	<p>[R1.10] (Reviewer 1, The methodology was revised as advised]</p> <p>[R1.11] (Reviewer 1, This manuscript not only focuses on design activities but also on constructing activities]</p> <p>[R2.1] (Reviewer 2, All mistakes are revised as advised]</p>
Results and Discussions	[R1.16] (Reviewer 1, This section hopes that the results of this measurement activity can be compared with other similar research activities)	[R1.16] (Reviewer 1, This point is also already revised as advised]
Conclusions	[R1.23] (Reviewer 1, In this section, the results obtained are not scientifically explained. It is following the objectives to be achieved and not in the form of narrative conclusions.)	[R1.23] (Reviewer 1, Thank you for fruitful insight, our conclusion also had been updated as advised to match our objectives]

2.3. Revision on Minor Comments

	Reviewers (R1 & R2)	Authors
	Minor Comments/Questions	Comments/Answers/Revisions in the Manuscript
Style/Grammar		

Consistency/Terminology		
References		
Tables		
Figures		
References, tables, and figures		

**** Add a yellow background to the revised/improved manuscript, according to the results of the review.**