



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRRI_5713
Title of the Manuscript:	Vibration Technique for Processing and Monitoring Electrical and Mechanical Defects in Electrical Drives Using 2-D Mathematical Model
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	<p>There is not a comparison between the analytical proposed model and the experimental result, thus the model is not validated.</p> <p>In the Peer Review Guidelines I read: "Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript?"</p> <p>Actually, I think the answer is: NO. Moreover: "Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims". I'm afraid , it does not happen</p> <p>Some sentences are a bit strange!</p> <p>Some equations contain misprint errors</p> <p>Some quantities are not defined</p> <p>Some sentences are not clear</p> <p>(for all these matter, see the attached file)</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Equations cannot be read (they are not sharp)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		