



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_9200
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION ON THE POSSIBILITY OF USING NATURAL RUBBER SEED OIL AS BRAKE FLUID
Type of the Article	Original research Work

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author wrote" The heat dissipated during braking is transformed into heat". This not clear! In this work we don't see the influence of viscosity which is very important. In the frictional forces there are tangential forces due to the viscosity which must be included in the calculations. The total energy doesn't equal to the work done by frictional because you don't take into account heat losses. the author determine the dry boiling ,wet boiling points, ph value , fluid stability,	Ok. Not clear. Agreed and that is why the braking efficiency cannot in any circumstances be equal to100%, even with conventional brake fluids. Agreed .Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	corrosion but not used neither in results nor in discussion. The results were presented in very poor manner. It would be better if you give curves to compare between SBF and NRF. The results not well discussed, as well, there is no explanation about why the NRF gives best results than SBF.	Not so. Presenting result in tabular form has its own advantages. SBF gives better results than NRF , but the results from NRS is very close to SBF .Results to be discussed further. Thanks.
Minor REVISION comments	The author needs to revise some written errors.	Agreed
Optional/General comments	The author doesn't master the theatrical aspect of this work. So I think that this study is not a research work but results of an experimental test without any explanation.	Not so. The author has published similar papers in this area. I appreciate your review comments on this subject.