# ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.
You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. ***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

| Date Manuscript Received: **May 2, 2018** | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: **May 15, 2018** |
|---|---|
| Manuscript Title:<br>**ELECTRICAL POWER GENERATION USING FOOTSTEPS** | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: **without number** | |

## Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.**

| ***Questions*** | ***Rating Result***<br>[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **1** |
| (a brief explanation is recommendable)<br><br>The topic is very relevant, therefore academic formality is required; physical laws can explicitly define the principle of operation, and to this end, build a mathematical model and a digital or virtual simulation. This work is based on basic concepts of sources without strict arbitration. The work submitted is very poor, without formal foundations, without clear experimental results, without originality, without adequate review of the state of technology or art. The idea is good, but the author needs to work on theoretical and experimental foundations. Therefore, the title is not appropriate to the content of the paper. | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **2** |
| *(An explanation is recommendable)*<br><br>The content is poor and without structure, therefore the abstract is also. The technological proposal does not have a method, the block diagram is not a formal algorithm, procedure or technique.<br>There are conceptual errors in the calculation of the output electrical power (nominal values), and the load flow test. | |
| **3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **2** |

*(a brief explanation is recommendable)*

The keywords are of little impact, do not place the content of the article. You can use: Electricity generation, Electric power generator, Piezoelectric device, Footstep electronics tool, hydraulic pressure, sustainable energy, for example. The keywords that are used are the constituent elements of the experimental platform, and that does not place the article in the literature. The technical language is very limited.

| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **1** |
|---|---|

*(An explanation is recommendable)*

Without formal method, the technological proposal is based on a good idea but without academic bases. I strongly recommend strengthening the content. Understand the physical laws of hydraulics, electricity and mechanics. With this, understand the physical phenomena in each element of the proposed experimental platform; and obtain a mathematical model that strengthens the proposal. This clarifies the design and easily proposes modifications or alternatives.

| **5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.** | **1** |
|---|---|

*(An explanation is recommendable)*

There are notable conceptual errors, about the technical areas and the physical laws used. The sources of information are limited, and several cases with poor arbitration. The figures used are not original, you can locate the sources with Google images easily. I recommend creating your own schemes. 6 of 14 pages are used in the study of the state of the art, of which there are 2 of justification. Only 3 pages of 14 are used for the main proposal, with a very basic explanation.

| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **1** |
|---|---|

(An explanation is recommendable)

The idea of the project is good, although it is not new; There are several proposals in the literature, published in articles indexed or registered in patents (For example: “Floor tile generating electricity by making use of pedestrians”: CN202989725U or “Massage high-heeled shoe sole capable of generating electricity through movement”: CN104473372A). The summary and conclusions are based on the content of the paper, but the established proposal and the experimental result is very poor.

| **7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.**<br>*(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)* | **2** |
|---|---|

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

The references section has structure, but they are insufficient and of low impact index. The proposal is technological, so part of its references must be patents. USPTO Patent, EPO, Matheo or Google Patent are search options. The author writes the contents of the references, literally; and uses their diagrams. This is not adequate.

## Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|---|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | **X** |
| Reject | |

## Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The recommendation for the author is to work more in collaboration with colleagues in areas where you are not an expert. This is an interesting research work that requires multidisciplinary work.

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

If possible, I can guide the author to achieve a better result. The idea is interesting, but it is not an article that can be transcended by the way it is written and organized. If the author tries to submit the article again, I would like to be able to help as a reviewer. I would like to receive articles of mechatronics, haptic interfaces, physical rehabilitation, medical robotics, biomimetics and biomechanics.