



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_18856
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INFLUENCE OF THE DEPTH OF CUT ON THE TWO-WAY APPLICATION OF CUTTING FLUIDS
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>)



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	1. The analysis of literature is very poor. Only Indian authors are cited. It has to be significantly improved. 2. Figures 2.1-2.3 are trivial and show only how neglected is the test equipment. The same figures are in the paper [7] in the reference list. Isn't it autoplagiarism? 3. Lack of photo or scheme of experimental position. 4. All the results are given in the tables. Why there are no charts? 5. What are the differences between paper [7] in the reference list and the reviewed manuscript? 6. What was the tool? 7. What authors means writing "tool wear"? What kind of wear? How was determined the tool wear? 8. What was the workpiece? What material and geometry? 9. How were the fluids given – scheme or photo should be given? What means "normal soluble oil"? What oil was used? How many oil in the water?	1. It is not true that only Indian authors were cited. Other authors were cited. 2. The figures will be removed as they are considered irrelevant. However, it is not auto plagiarism, because the said paper [7] is my previous research work and i used the same machine and equipment to carry out this present work. There is no crime to use same equipment to carry out multiple researches as far as they are appropriate for such works. 3. Noted. Correction will be done. 4. It is not necessary, that is why there were no charts. 5. If the reviewer could not see the obvious difference, then these are the differences: i). [7] is a two-way/multiple cutting fluid feeding mechanism designed, constructed and tested. ii). the parameters of cutting and feeding angle were not varied there, while they were varied in this work. iii). this research



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. What was the pressure and quantity of fluid given? 11. How were the temperature measurements taken? 12. Methodology are described in a very brief and imprecise way. Should be improved.	focused on the influence of a cutting variable (the depth of cut) on the performance of a two-way feeding of Cutting fluid. 6. Carbide Tool Insert 7. Flank tool wear. Appropriate corrections will be effected in the manuscript. 8. The workpiece was a cylindrical medium carbon steel. Its geometry was not taken because it is irrelevant in this research. 9. Noted. Adequate explanation has been given in the manuscript. For the photo refer figure 2.1 in manuscript. 10. Not determined. 11. Noted (see the experimental procedure section) 12. Ok. Appropriate corrections have been effected in the manuscript to address the issue. More detailed methodology was given in the revised manuscript.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Many editorial mistakes like writing Celcius degree with a small letter. In my opinion there are some common parts in this text with article [7] from the reference list. It should be clarified.	Corrected Clarification has been made. See answers to questions 2 & 5 above.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	–	