



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_22868
Title of the Manuscript:	Spectrum Diagnostics of a Damaged Differential Planetary Gear during Various Operating Conditions
Type of the 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider including a small list or flowchart in the end of the <i>Introduction</i>, summarizing the structure of this work, in order for the reader to find it easier to follow up. 2. The caption and the figure/table must be put together and avoid being separated to two pages. Hence, the authors are proposed to double check the Tables 1 and 2. 3. The meaning of every symbol should be explained when it is first introduced. Therefore, the meanings of θ_g and θ_p on page 3 must be identified. 4. The quality of the figures from 1 to 4, 8, and 11 to 13 is obscure. They must be redrawn or translated into a high-resolution graphics. In this way, it will be easier for the reader to understand what the authors want to express. 5. The marks in Fig. 5 should be explained, for example, the meanings of 1 planet, 2 planets and 3 planets. 6. The "Fig. No." in Table 4 indicates there are 42 figures in the article. Hence, a double check about the problem is necessary in this manuscript. 7. Tables 5 and 6 should be mentioned on page 14. 8. The quantitative results in the conclusions must be shown. 	<p>Thanks for the reviewer's detail valuable feedback. We really appreciate it. We already fixed the problems. Earlier revisions of this paper included additional figures in Section 4 and 5. These figures were deleted for clarity prior to submission. Table 4 has also been deleted as was the original intention. Please refer to our revised version.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		