Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_69673**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Cost implications of Equipment Failures using Life cost based Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA) on 365KVA Caterpillar Generator**
Type of the Article	**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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	- We do not put in the abstract the formulas or the references. The abstract is to give an overall idea about the work, focusing on the purpose and the methodology. The abstract should be rewritten as there are a number of sentences with no coherence and needed info about the paper is missing. In this section, you need to briefly present the scope of this paper, the utilized methods, the results, and the contributions of the paper. - Low thematic relevance: there are many works that have dealt with maintenance costs with more efficient methods, for example using machine learning and also using fuzzy logic. This proposal is not worthy for a scientific article. - in the introduction, the paragraph for structuring the paper is missing. - The literature review is weak. You just presented the history and evolution of AMDEC. You did not do a review study and discuss the work that has already dealt with FMEA. How you felt that the proposed method it is new??? - There is a lack of data in relation to the problem statement. - For the determination of the formula for the cost calculation. You used a reference from 2009, weren't there any new features since this year?? Knowing that now we are really talking about industry 4.0 and maintenance 4.0 - How we understand and evaluate the data that are included in Tables from 1 to 5. If we take the example of the frequency values of Table 1, what that means 20 and 6. How these values were determined? - tables are not discussed. - The references presented are few. You really need to enrich the work with more references. You should also review the structure of the presented references. - The conclusion takes up sentences already mentioned in the introduction. It must be reformulated by exposing the results obtained and also adding perspectives. - Finally, after reading the full paper, it becomes clear that there is a great need for proofreading the text. There are a plethora of grammatical and syntax errors and coherence is absent from many sentences	Corrected Noted and effected Added Noted and done the revision Added as suggested Amended Noted Corrected Some recent references have been added Effected on revised manuscript Fixed the grammatical errors
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	