



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_41472
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF METALLIC CONTENT IN LUBRICANT OIL WHITH PREDICTIVE PORPOUSES
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1) Some language error should be corrected. 2) The widely accepted way to define metal content of oil phases is the Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometer (ICP-OES & or MS). Atom absorption is a long outdated method. 3) Data presented in 'Table 4' hints on some unusual phenomenon. Lead and what is more interesting magnesium is able to deposit and to lower its concentration by time namely in the first period (copper deposition in the system composed of less noble structure metals)? Calcium and zinc similarly? I think it really needs real explanation of the cause. Such a variation of the oil characteristics or otherwise called altered quality change should not be allowed for the experiment to perform. I suppose validation experiment should be carried out for verification purposes (new experiment to undergo). 4) Total acid number, iodine or bromine number and dynamic viscosity were not determined? They should have been defined by the authors. 5) The conclusion is rather a summery. It is too long and inadequate by having a table 'Table 6' in it. That table must be replaced into the introduction. 'Table 7, 8 and 9' should be presented in the results section of the manuscript which will be more detailed by this modification. Please make it a real conclusion by shortening it whilst focusing on concise and abstract part of outcome of the experiments.	The experiment is carried out using the lubricating oil in a truck under normal service conditions; the truck previously used another oil in its lubrication system. 1) The language has been corrected. 2) Reviewed in conclusions. 3) The data in table 4 are explained in the results section. 4) Reviewed in conclusions. The diesel oil grade 15W / 40 used in the study is a commercial oil API CI-4. 5) Revised conclusions: Table 6 is now present in the introduction (Table 2) Table 7, 8 and 9 are now presents in the results section.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you very much for reviewing the article