

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_85313
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Simulation of Amphibious Wheel-Foot Composite Mechanism
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstracts are still dominant in the introduction, and research objectives have not adopted the methods used and the expected results specifically for the expectation of the purpose in the research	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the introduction, it is necessary to add literature from previous studies, and the objectivity of the study also needs to be emphasized in the introduction.• Table 1 the main dimension, the 3D model as shown in Figure 5, needs to be annotated.• For the results of the analysis of floating underwater the magnitude of the different thrusts needs to be specified.• For the results on the Advantages of the design (4.3) please show a comparison of the two independent inputs of the eccentric displacement and the eccentric angle of the previous gear, there is a dynamic coupling between the two input ends of the planetary gear mechanism.• In conclusion, for the simulation of the motion of the wheel-foot composite mechanism carried out with animated demonstrations, and obtained a motion pattern similar to the theoretical calculations in this paper, there is no analysis that proves the theoretical truth in the results section and needs to be shown.• Reference needs to be entered the type of software used for simulation	
Optional/General comments	The overall the script is pretty good, but some parts need to be improved.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pribadyo
Department, University & Country	Teuku Umar University, Indonesia