



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRRI_5713
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Vibration Technique for Processing and Monitoring Electrical and Mechanical Defects in Electrical Drives Using 2-D Mathematical Model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Paper</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>There is not a comparison between the analytical proposed model and the experimental result, thus the model is not validated.</b></p> <p><b>In the Peer Review Guidelines I read: "Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript?"</b></p> <p><b>Actually, I think the answer is: NO. Moreover: "Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims". I'm afraid , it does not happen</b></p> <p><b>Some sentences are a bit strange!</b></p> <p><b>Some equations contain misprint errors</b></p> <p><b>Some quantities are not defined</b></p> <p><b>Some sentences are not clear</b></p> <p><b>(for all these matter, see the attached file)</b></p>	<p><b>1-Yes, the comparison between the analytical proposed model and the experimental results is added and the model does really show its validity because the experimental do really agree with the theoretical ones " Please do check the revised version containing tables and curves in yellow colour (Practical and Experimental ).</b></p> <p><b>2-The paper is dealing with three type of faults or anomalies which may happen while the machine is running in other way the detection of anomalies online:</b></p> <p><b>First , faults due to shorted turns only (without eccentricity),</b></p> <p><b>Second , Faults due to eccentricity only (without shorted turns),</b></p> <p><b>While the third case is when the anomaly is a double fault and thus the machine has a short and an eccentricity.</b></p> <p><b>-The first study (short circuit), the model did show a good agreement between theoretical and experimental.</b></p> <p><b>- The second study ( Eccentricity), the model did show a good agreement between theoretical and experimental.</b></p> <p><b>- The third study which is a double fault ( Short and eccentricity), in this case , the sensors or the search coils may give a faulty indication of the position of the fault, and thus, I tried to analyse the harmonic analysis using FFT algorithm, it</b></p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>seems that there could be a solution by analysing special harmonics which could have a relationship with the type of fault and its position. This is a prediction from the FFTA analysis, the mathematical analysis model is ongoing and more deep analysis (theoretical and practical ) will be done and if the latter would work well , a new mathematical regarding specific harmonics model will be published and that seems somehow promising.</p> <p><b>3- It says that Some sentences are a bit strange!</b> yes I do respect all the comments and there could be some strange sentences, but unfortunately, I myself passed through all the paper many times , but I could not really found and even guess where these sentences are, Unfortunately, I could correct them if You could indicate such sentences.</p> <p><b>4- Some equations contain misprint errors:</b> The same as above I wish I could be given the exact number of the equation</p> <p><b>5- Some quantities are not defined.</b> Please, can I have quantities which are not defined</p> <p><b>6- Some sentences are not clear.</b> The same comments as above(3, 4, 5 and 6) Please, do indicate such sentences in order to be able to make them more clear.</p> <p><b>7-(for all these matter, see the attached file)</b> <b>Unfortunately , I did not receive any attached file with the review forms , and all I received is my paper under review plus all the review forms. The editor could have forgotten to send the attachment regarding points 3,4,5 6 and 7 .</b></p>
--	--	---



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Equations cannot be read (they are not sharp)</b>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		