

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_123645</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Non-tipping Rod in Quiescent Water Based on Static Moment Equilibrium</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript describes an interesting method relative to a non-tipping rod device. It is constructed based on the principle of static moment equilibrium. The device can maintain balance in water without being overturned by an external wind torque. The rod allows for handy adjustment of the center of gravity and the buoyancy center, with the inclination angle recorded by the three-axis sensor in the rod. The method appears interesting and presents several possible applications. The description of the experimental part proving the characteristics of the method is very well developed. Ultimately, the method is based on a simple idea, but well defined and developed in its parts.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it appears correct and comprehensive.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	I think that the abstract of the article is well-written, clear, and comprehensive.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, I consider the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate. Only, the subsections could be spaced more widely, for reasons of comprehensibility.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript appears correct, well-structured, and understandable. The subject of the manuscript, which is a non-tipping Rod in Quiescent Water Based on Static Moment Equilibrium, appears innovative. The model and the solution method are clearly outlined. The experimental section is well-defined and in-depth. In particular, the device preparation, experimental procedures, and the discussion of the results are really well-developed.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	In general, yes they are sufficient. Nevertheless, I can suggest completing the references, with other references, as in the example: 1. Mohammed Khair Al-Solihat. "Nonlinear static and dynamic behaviors of partially and fully submerged rod pendulums in quiescent water". Nonlinear Dynamics; 2024. 2. Ning Han, Pei-Pei Lu. "Nonlinear Dynamics of a Classical Rotating Pendulum System with Multiple Excitations". Chinese Physics B; 2020.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English could be improved in some parts. Some spelling and grammar should be checked carefully. One practical approach for authors to optimize their articles could be to incorporate proofreading tools such as "Grammarly".	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In conclusion, we can say that the manuscript appears to be a very good work in the field considered. Nevertheless, we think is better to complete the references and improve the English language.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roberto P.L. Caporali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Italy</b>