SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2013_PRRI_3199**
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CONVERGENCE OF NORMALIZED VEHICULAR ROLLING FRICTION COEFFICIENT (C_m) BY DYNAMIC HIGH SPEED IMAGING AND LEAST SQUARE OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUES.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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. Fig. 1 is not referenced in the text. In fig. 1b the vertical component of the contact reaction is not described. 2. Line 71, "in on" – either "in" or "on". Correct the sentence. 3. Lines 82-87. The sentence is too long and thus incomprehensible. Please convert it into 2 shorter sentences. 4. Lines 84 and 85. The quantities A and D are not explained in the text. 5. Line 94, "refer" instead of "refers". 6. Line 96, SC_{ent} instead of SC_{cent}. 7. Line 100, V_0 is not defined. 8. Line 106, F_{Drag} instead of F_{drag}. 9. Line 106, C_d or C_D? 10. Line 106, V seems to be too large! 11. Line 106, comma "," before "where" is necessary. 11. Fig. 2. It is unclear how to obtain coefficients SC_{ex} and SC_{ent} . Please explain this in the text. 12. Line 127, v_0 is not defined. 13. Line 127, f_x is not defined (a function or a vector component?); does it have anything to do with x (horizontal) component? If not, another superscript is recommended. 14. Line 128, two commas are necessary, i.e. "...number, where Re=$uA^{1/2}/\nu$, and..." 15. Line 129, a comma "," before "where" is necessary; a full stop "." before "Hence" is necessary. 16. Line 129, "can" instead of "cane". 17. Line 131, again it is not clear if f_y has anything to do	

	with y (vertical) direction! 18. Line 131, a comma "," is necessary before "which". 19. Line 133, it is not clear what speed the author means; "this speed" is not enough. 20. Line 145, W_p instead of $\mathrm{W_p}$. 21. Line 148, W_g instead of $\mathrm{W_g}$. 22. Line 150. "Hence" instead of "hence"; a full stop "." Is necessary before "Hence". 23. Line 152, "simplified" instead of "simplify it". 24. Line 153. Again, a comma "," before "where" is necessary. 25. Line 157. Consider $u=(2SG\rho\Delta h)^{1/2}/\rho_{air}$ instead of application of the square root symbols. This suggestion refers to the entire paper. 26. Lines 162-164. This sentence is not clear, especially the last part containing "given". Either the sentence should be divided into two simpler sentences or some commas should be utilized. 27. Line 169. Again, it seems to me that V is too large. Besides, the differences between V, $\bar{V}$ and u are unclear. Please rectify this. 28. Line 169. Consider the multiplication by 0.5 instead of $\frac{1}{2}$ or the division by 2 instead. This suggestion refers to all equations of the paper. 29. Line 174. Z_{depth} is not defined. 30. The section Results and Discussion should be divided into subsections concerning: presentation of the own results, verification of this results, comparison with the other methods etc. In the present version the material seems to be mixed, or at least one can hardly distinguish between the presentation of author's own results and their comparison with other researchers' results. 31. Lines 199. Bars over the: V_{ex} and V_{ent} should be	

	placed above the main symbol V only, not above the superscripts. The present bars are too long. 32. Lines 201 and 202. Bars over the following symbols: σ_V, σ_T,σa should be placed just above the main symbol σ, not above the superscripts. Moreover, σa should be changed with σ_a. All the superscripts should be italic. 33. Table 6-7, the first row. The dots "." after the superscripts in: m_t., C_d., C_{rr}. seem to be spurious. It seems also that C_d should be replaced with C_D. 34. Line 208. F_{sup}-F_{drug}-$F_{rolling}$ is not an equation. This term should be equated either to 0 or ΣF. All forces terms should be written in italics. Shouldn't F_{drug} be replaced with F_{Drug}? 35. Line 208. Also, the term following F_{sup}-F_{drug}-$F_{rolling}$ is not an equation. 36. Lines 208 and 209. How many sentences we have in this two lines? Besides, these sentences are incomprehensible. 37. Line 213. The full stop "." should be relocated and placed after the parenthesis. 38. Line 218. A verb is missing after "can". 39. Line 227, a comma "," after "a car" is necessary. 40. Line 228, a comma "," after "found" is necessary. 41. Line 230, C_D should be placed before ρ_{air}. Moreover, the star sign "*" is spurious. 43. Lines 232-239. This sentence is too long. It is completely incomprehensible. Divide it into two or three sentences. Moreover, there are lacks of verbs in this long sentence. 44. Line 238, two commas "," before "where" and before "and" are necessary. 45. Line 240. It is unclear what "this" means. Replace this with an appropriate noun. 46. Line 243. It is unclear for the reviewer what the origin of the equation in this line is.	

	47. Table 8, first row. The bars over three terms with C as a main symbol are too long. They should be placed over C only. This remark refers also to the text below the table. 48. Line 246. The text in the parenthesis is not clear to the reviewer – a verb is missing. 49. Line 258. The sentence should be changed to "This is a direct confirmation of the present study as..." 50. Line 263. Change "the this" with "this". 51. Line 277. Mathematical symbols of the equation in this line should be italic. 52. Line 278 and 279. Mathematical symbols should be italic. 53. The brackets should be changed with parentheses, i.e. we should have $\left(\frac{1}{2}g\right)$. This remark refers also to lines 289, 290, 296,305 and 316. 54. Consider replacement of $\frac{\delta}{gc}$ with δ/gc, and $\frac{h}{b}$ with h/b. 55. Line 289, replace "is the is the" with "is the". 56. Line 291, a comma "," is missing before "where". 57. Line 296, the symbol m should be italic. 58. Line 298, T and t symbols should be italic. 59. Line 299, l and r do not appear in the preceeding equation – something is wrong. Also, a comma "," is missing before "where". 60. Lines 269-323, the material is too long; it should be divided into paragraphs, with clear indication what is performed in each paragraph. 61. Line 311, a comma "," is necessary after the equation and before "where"; "g" should be italic; "Where" should be changed with "Additionally". 62. Line 312, "a", "b", "c" and "b" again should be italic. 63. Lines 313 and 314, change "c" and "b" as well as "a"	

	and “c” with its italic counterparts. 64. Line 315, How can two coefficients “a” and “c” be determined from one equation. Only “c” is present in this equation. 65. Line 315 and 316, T_i and i should be italic. 66. Table 9 does not possess its number an caption. 67. The values of the error from the last column of table 9 are the same as in the last column of table 8. This fact should be commented. 68. Line 326, “Knowing rolling friction...” should be replaced with “The knowledge of the rolling friction...” or “Getting to know the rolling friction...” 69. Line 336, “...designed that have...” should be replaced with “...designed so as to have...” 70. Line 337, “are” should be changed with “is”. 71. Line 338, I suggest to replace “This model...” with “The presented model...”. 72. Line 347, ”J. Bernoulli” is doubled. I suppose one is spurious. 73. Line 351. This line should not be justified. 74. Line 424, 430 and 441. Dots ‘’.’’ are missing after the first letters of the first names of the authors. 75. Lines 347-441. In the case of the second or third author, the first letter of his/her first name should follow his/her family name, as in the case of the first author.	

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There is no doubt that the paper should be published as the presented material is original and worth of dissemination. However the number of the necessary editorial amendments is large and thus the paper cannot be printed in its present form. Please rectify the listed amendments and present the corrected version for the second review.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer