

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_77995
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of the Correlation Coefficient for Rotating Machine Monitoring
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>The work needs major revision due to problems in statistical analysis and discussion.</p> <p>Dear Ms. Ruma Bag, I am sending you the review of the manuscript <b>JERR_77995</b>, titled: <b>Use of the Correlation Coefficient for Rotating Machine Monitoring</b>.</p> <p>In this paper, the authors propose a new method of monitoring the functioning of a rotating machine. The topic is interesting and the obtained results are promising. However, the work needs major revision due to problems in statistical analysis and discussion. In following text I would give some remarks and suggestions for the improvement of the work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Novelty and contribution of the paper needs to be further highlighted.</li> <li>2. Why do authors choose 512 point windows for their work? Please explain.</li> <li>3. What the performance metrics used for method and algorithm validation against an existing approach? Elaborate on this part, please</li> <li>4. I think the addition of experimental validation would be a big plus. If possible, I want to ask the authors to compare his results with experimental data which was published in other papers. Therefore, this model and its results give more confidence in term of reliability and accuracy for future researchers.</li> <li>5. The conclusion section is clear. Please provide the future activity of this research. I suggest adding the experimental validation of this test.</li> </ol> <p><b>General remarks:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) All references of the section part and citation are not formatted according to Author's guidelines.</li> <li>2) Throughout the text some authors have been cited by their first name and it should be cited by last (family) name. The whole text including section References should be checked for this error.</li> <li>3) Take into confederation the index format for <math>Y_i</math> of the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>In citation the last(family) name should be used instead of first name            ...“ Merzoug M et al. 2014, developed a dynamic gearing model”...</p> <p>...“ Oulmane A et al. 2014, proposed a method for detecting wear on a ball bearing.</p> <p>...“Bo Li et al. 2000, ....            Minamihara H et al. 1990,            J. Rafiee et al.</p> <p>[2] In the references section 1 should be omitted.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Bouguenna Driss</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mustapha Stambouli of Mascara, Algeria</b>