

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_103734
Title of the Manuscript:	Magnetic Nanoparticles-Loaded Poly(Methyl Methacrylate) Bone Cements for Magnetic Hyperthermia Treatment of Bone Tumors: State-of-the-Art Review
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	YES YES NO NO NO TO MUCH REFERENCE THIS STUDY ONLY HAS AN INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION AS A CHAPTER OF AN ARTICLE. It lacks objectives, methodology, results and discussion. looks like a monograph for thesis or dissertation it does not say what kind of literature review it is. it does not say how many references it sought how did you get the references which ones excluded no inclusion criteria There are figures without references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahomed Sidique Abdul Cadar Dadá
Department, University & Country	Mozambique