



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACRI_15945
Title of the Manuscript:	Applying vibrodiagnostics control and composite materials for increasing the productivity of production machines
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The abstract is very vague and confused. It is very difficult to find the key-point in this part. I strongly suggest that this abstract should be re-written. 2. The structure of this manuscript should be arranged in a relatively logic style, i. e. The readers of this manuscript hardly find out which part is already belonging to the current development in this field and which part is your improvement. 3. In the whole manuscript, the English level is very poor. I strongly suggest that the authors ask help from some language edition organization or native English speaker to polish this manuscript. 4. The title of this manuscript is not suitable regarding the main content of the manuscript.	1. The abstract is re-written. 2. The structure of paper is re-arranged to be more clear what is our improvement. The whole paper is description of case study in which several institutions participated because of large scope of knowledge. Chapters 2 and 3 are analyses and our improvements. The measuring was made in cooperation with company Technical Diagnostics, ltd. as it was mentioned in original text (row 78 and 340). The numerical simulation of shock wave propagation was done by members of research group from Academy of Armed Forces of Slovak Republic that participate in previous research projects focused on simulation of fiber composite materials. 3. We have tried to improve English level. We apologize, but due to lack of time the manuscript has not been polished by language organization. In case it would be reason not to publish paper, please, give us more time. 4. The title of manuscript is changed. We hope it would be better now.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Literatures should be cited in the “introduction” parts; 2. Figure 10 should be presented more clearly.	1. We agree, the citations are moved into introduction. 2. The graphs in previous Fig. 10 are changed by cutting the margins so that the graph bodies are better readable.
---	---	---