

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_91531
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF VARYING FIBRE GLASS WITH PLASTER OF PARIS (POP)
Type of the Article	EVALUATION OF VARYING FIBRE GLASS WITH PLASTER OF PARIS (POP)

### 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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1-More significant findings (%) are needed. 2- Review for literature considering the relevant studies is not adequate. The question of the study need to be discussed clearly. The contribution and significance of the present work are not clear. 3- More important tests should be done: fracture, tension test, fineness, etc. 4-Sec.3.2: Hardness and impact tests: What is the purpose of these tests? 5-deep discussions for all results are needed. 6-Conclusions: Conclusion section is inadequate, re-write with specific findings (%) that reflect the significance of the study. 7-References: Most of the references are irrelevant to the topics of the present work and back to more than 5 years ago. 8- Proofreading for the manuscript is needed. 9-More comments are included in the reviewer attachment.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Non	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Non	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qasim M. Shakir
Department, University & Country	University of Kufa, Iraq