Feedback from the Reviewers

C. Clarity of presentation:

English grammar and spelling are proper ------------------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Figures and tables are well constructed and informative -------------------------- [3 - I agree]

The paper is well organized ------------------------------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

T. Technical innovation and relevance

The authors cite other relevant publications ------------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ------------------------- [3 - I agree]

The authors apply sound technical approaches ------------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

New ideas are convincingly and logically described ------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

Results are convincing ----------------------------------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

Considering the issues above, this work should be presented --------------------- [3 - I agree]

Comments:

Your survey addresses aspects of interest concerning the nowadays modular motor drives.

It is well done, and please consider the following recommendations regarding the clarity of your manuscript.

1. You have presented a comparison between different inverter topologies with regard to “motor side”, DC-link, efficiency etc. The “motor side” is one of the “evaluation parameters” (Section III.A) but you have used a single type of motor. Please clarify the place of this criteria in your investigation, or consider re-organization of the paper (e.g. you might present the single type of motor as a use case, rather than criteria).

İsimlendirme değiştirilecek

Motor için tablo verelim

2. The paper is well organized and clearly written, with only two exceptions: figure 1 (hardly readable), and two sentences that start with numbers (e.g. the sentence “2L-2S-VSI is the [...]”), at the beginning of Section II.B.

Please fix them.

Fig. 1 düzeltildi

2L düzeltildi

And you should use (Ampers) or (A), as SI unit, not “Amps” (it would be unappropriated in an IEEE conference).

Amps yok ☺

C. Clarity of presentation:

English grammar and spelling are proper ------------------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Figures and tables are well constructed and informative -------------------------- [3 - I agree]

The paper is well organized ------------------------------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

T. Technical innovation and relevance

The authors cite other relevant publications ------------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ------------------------- [3 - I agree]

The authors apply sound technical approaches ------------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

New ideas are convincingly and logically described ------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

Results are convincing ----------------------------------------------------------- [3 - I agree]

Considering the issues above, this work should be presented --------------------- [3 - I agree]

Comments:

Equation (3) has no meaning.

Artık meaningful

C. Clarity of presentation:

English grammar and spelling are proper ------------------------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ------------------------ [3 - I agree]

Figures and tables are well constructed and informative -------------------------- [0 - I strongly disagree]

The paper is well organized ------------------------------------------------------ [2 - I am neutral]

Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ------------------------------ [1 - I disagree]

T. Technical innovation and relevance

The authors cite other relevant publications ------------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ------------------------- [4 - I strongly agree]

The authors apply sound technical approaches ------------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

New ideas are convincingly and logically described ------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

Results are convincing ----------------------------------------------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

Considering the issues above, this work should be presented --------------------- [2 - I am neutral]

Comments:

1. The figures that show the harmonic content are unintelligible for me.

Haklısın. Yorumları arttıralım

2. The 2-level series and parallel configurations should be explained by figures, the way the motor is connected.

Okey. Fig. no’lar kontrol et

3. It is not clear if the presented results were validated by the authors themselves. Experimental results

would be required.

It is pretty clear for us ☺