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 Atom absorption is a long outdated method. 3) Data presented in 'Table 4' hints on some unusual phenomenon.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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Gergely András***
Department, University & Country	***Hungary***