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1. Scientific merit:
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2. Clarity of expression:  
Are the author(s)’ ideas and discussion of concepts well communicated? Yes  No   
Is the manuscript easy to read? Yes  No

3. Suitable referencing:  
Do the author(s) make reference to the most recent and most appropriate work? (If no, please provide references in the “Comments and suggestions to the author(s)”) Yes  No

**B. Quality criteria**

1. Originality:

Is the work relevant and novel? Yes  No

2. Motivation (All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results):  
Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? Yes  No

3. Repetition:  
Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? (If yes, please provide information on the previous publication in “Confidential comments to the editors”)   
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4. Length:  
Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length? Yes  No

**C. Presentation criteria**
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Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article? Yes  No
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**E. Comments and suggestions to the author(s)**

Please explain your opinion, guide revisions and describe your specific concerns.

* You should correct typo of first line of third paragraph in Introduction section.  
  “An superconducting magnetic bearing (SMB) is a contactless bearing [3]. it employs an..”
  1. Fixed.
* In figure 2 (a), hall measurement results have almost same values with laser gauge output. Is this a coincidence? You need to explain the relation between hall and laser data.
  1. This is just a coincidence. The lager gauge measures the actual position displacement of the rotor, while the hall sensor measures the displacement of the magnetic field. We can’t compare their absolute values directly.
* I recommend you increase the font and figure size of figure 2 for readability.
  1. Fixed.