

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_101808
Title of the Manuscript:	IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS OF THE INDUSTRIAL USE OF NFRPCs
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, manuscript has an interesting topic and is informative. Therefore, it is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. I would suggest the following title for the manuscript: "In-Depth Review and Analysis for the Applications and Manufacturing of NFRPCs."</p> <p>3. Abstract needs to be re-written 150 to 200 words. I would recommend explaining more about the novelty of the manuscript in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figures 1, 3, and 5 are blur. Please edit these figures. - In the "Keywords" section, it's recommended to use maximum 3 words in each section of it. Please revise accordingly. - There are grammatical errors in the manuscript; In section 2, line 4; In section 4, line 3; ... Please revise the whole manuscript. - I would recommend explaining more about the novelty of the manuscript in the "Conclusions" section of the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are grammatical errors in the manuscript; In section 2, line 4; In section 4, line 3; ... Please revise the whole manuscript. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Anvari
Department, University & Country	University of Missouri, United States of America