



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_44221
Title of the Manuscript:	Double-Balanced Mixer for RF Applications
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	- Line 19-21: Make diagram bolder, font size of characters used in the diagram is too small. Consider increasing the size of the figure including making the outline of the shapes bolder and clearer. The authors should consider revising the figure as a whole. The authors could also consider giving a brief detail of how the block works in preceding lines 23-26. - Line 23-26: INTRODUCTION: The objective of the paper should come as the last paragraph in the introduction. The objective of the paper should be added in the introduction. The objective of the paper should be added in the introduction. - Line 56-61: Eq. 1 and Eq. 2. Consider the revision of the equations 1 and 2 using an appropriate equation editor and equations should be centralized away from the text of the paper. Equations should be revised and labelled respectively with visible and bold writings. - Line 106: Shown in Fig.4... Considering figure 4, the authors should consider making Figure 4 bolder, larger and the characters associated to the figure should be made more visible. The authors should consider a more clear and visible diagram for figure 4. - The characters in Fig. 5, Fig. 6, Fig. 7, Fig. 8, Fig. 9 should be boldened to make for easier comprehension. As a whole, the images and text in the figures should be made clearer. - The citations stopped at [6] when the reference was up to [14]? - If the Double-Balanced mixer was implemented as mentioned in 'line 97' and mounted on a board as mentioned in 'line 92'. The images of what was implemented should be made available in the paper work.	- Done - Done - Done - Done - Done [7] [8] [9] were cited in Table 1. Added [10]. [11] to [14] are already cited/present. - Sentence reconstructed to avoid confusion.
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 141- "Table3" should be changed to "Table 3". - Line 70: Consider revising the line. ...because of the contribution of noise from other frequencies (apart from the input RF signal).	- Done - Done
Optional/General comments	The authors should consider a more detailed introduction; a more detailed introduction would suffice.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	