

### 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> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>	Authors consider a simple non-tipping rod device, which can maintain balance in quiescent water. The method of study comprises several errors in drawing and analytical approaches that should be corrected.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title does not respond to the content which should be revised.	
<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>	The abstract should be revised because it comprises useless sentences like the device will not ... without being overturned by external wind force. The design does not give such conditions..	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript should be revised by the typical format of the presentations with blanks between the titles of sections, figures, tables etc. and text. The figure should be presented by the rules of standard drawing	
<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 comprises analytical approaches with static and dynamic components. The negative buoyancy force of the emerged wedge is not clear. It should act in the negative direction and consider only. the emerged part.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	fair	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	, the terms should be clear expressing the content. For example, "the hollow rod" can be changed on "a tube" and others	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The work should be revised	

**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>Ryspek Usubamatov</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kyrgyz State Technical University, Kyrgyzstan</b>