NOTES on the article

1. The Introduction section should contain an analysis (!) and criticism (!) of previously obtained research results on the topic stated by the authors. Only this approach allows us to assess the relevance of the tasks formulated by the authors. In this article, the Introduction section is similar to the lecture for students in the "Agricultural Machinery" discipline. The reviewer saw neither analysis nor criticism nor the ensuing research objectives.

2. Tables 1 and 2 present the results of the disc coulter parameters measurements. Further, their analysis requires proof that the deviations obtained during measurement are not random. And this could be exactly the case!
Deviations of average values are usually assessed, for example, using the $LSD_{05(01)}$ criterion. Mean square deviations (via variances) – according to Fisher's F-test. Since there is none of this in the article, the data in Tables 1 and 2 are unsuitable for statistical (!) analysis.

3. The R^2 coefficient is usually called the DETERMINATION coefficient, not the CORRELATION coefficient.

4. The choice of the correlation relationship (linear or curvilinear) type is carried out after comparing the values of the **correlation ratio** and the **coefficient of determination** using the F-test. However, the authors did not do this. As a result of their subjective approach, the curvilinearity of the correlation between the studied parameters in many cases looks unreliable [see, for example, Fig. 8 (D = 340, 360 mm), Fig. 9 (D = 320, 340 mm].

5. The use of linear correlation in Figure 10 (left) is particularly questionable. This is supported by the very low value of the determination coefficient R^2 = 0.528. This indicates that the linear correlation between "Frequency" and "Exterior diameter" is valid in 52.8% of cases. Is this enough for such a statement?

6. The adequacy of the normal (or any other) law of distribution of measured quantities must be PROVEN(!) using some criterion (χ^2 - Pearson, for example). Since this was not done in the article, the authors' statements about the normality of the distribution of the processes they studied are unproven and, therefore, UNLAWFUL!

7. Table 3 is unreadable due to unclear symbols.

8. What does the first paragraph of the conclusions have to do with the results of the authors' research? The fourth point of the conclusions does not reflect the pattern. The reviewer did not see them in the article at all.

Conclusion: the work presented by the authors bears little resemblance to a scientific article. There is no REASONABLE goal setting. There is no adequate, scientifically proven analysis of the data obtained. NEW scientific patterns reflected in the article's conclusions have not been established. Therefore, the article should be COMPLETELY redone. This form is not suitable for publication.