



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJAST_20747</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>System model of a technical level rolling bearings</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>(1)</b> <b>Introduction</b> Authors are suggested to add some latest information and introduce current research hotspots in this part.</p> <p><b>(2)</b> <b>The discussion part should be written in detail and clear.</b> e.g. Efficiency of performance of the offered modernization providing at the expense of increase in quantity of rollers increase of dynamic loading capacity and a resource of the bearing respectively for 10,5% and 19%, decrease in loads of a separator by 11% by improvement of internal dynamics of the bearing, possibility of stabilization of temperature condition of operation of the bearing at increase of speed of the train to 300 km/h thanks to separator material replacement is as a result confirmed. <b>Authors should write more clearly about the comparing experimental results, not only by listing the increasing rate.</b></p>	<p>Authors agree with all remarks of the reviewer. Changes are made in the text.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>(1)</b> <b>References</b> 4 of 10 references are from Gaydamak A, but authors did not provide clearly what Gaydamak A do and the value of comparison.</p>	<p>Changes are made in the text.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>(2) Some expressions are not clear enough and authors should carefully check and verify them.</p> <p>Changes are made in the text.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		Authors agree with all remarks of the reviewer and express him the gratitude for the qualified article assessment