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	

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	**INTRODUCTION:** 1. Justification for considering Natural rubber seed oil as brake fluid relative to conventional brake fluid is lacking in the text. 2. Review of relevant literature in the study area is completely missing. 3. Lines 14 -19 are not strong points to start up discussion for the given subject matter. **It would make more sense to begin with what is a common or general knowledge about conventional brake fluid, including their importance. Thereafter, state what literature provides on the problems of these conventional brake fluids. From there, the author(s) should state the possibility of using vegetable oils as potential brake fluid, and why Natural rubber seed oil is a choice for this study**. 4. There should have been more than only one literature reference backing the claims of the general characteristics of brake fluid as outlined in Lines 36-46. **MODELS AND THEORIES:** 1. Lines 56 and 57 have wrong text reference format: They should have been such: **(Shigley, 1977); (Khurmi *et al.*, 2005).** 2. Line 78 should be recast to make it meaningful.	

	METHODOLOGY: 1. Source and grade of materials should be included and any pre-treatment processes, if any, which the material was subjected to, should be stated. 2. The author(s) claim determination of viscosity, dry boiling point, wet boiling point, etc but fails to state the procdures utilized. 3. Moreover, the only test on the brake fluid described is not stated whether is improvised or based on standard method. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** The table formats for results presentation are not conventional. 1. The results were merely presented but not discussed satisfactory. The obtained results should have been discussed in the light of current literature on similar studies to show similarities or contrasts with appropriate explanation to justify the observations. **REFERENCES:** Besides being out-of-date, they are not based on journals. This is very disappointing.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. Follow right format for use of '***et al.*, '.** 2. The paper should be checked by an English r correction of grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	NIL	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria**