

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_100846
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioceramics in textiles: New Far infrared textiles medical applications
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Considering the applicability of smart materials in the healthcare and other fields of human endeavour, I believe the manuscript is adequate for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No, the abstract is not comprehensive enough. The authors can do better by starting with a general view of bioceramic in smart material, then proceed to tell the reader the aim of the study, the methodology employed in the research, the study outcome and finally, the study implication.</p> <p>The subsections are too many. I am wondering if there's a journal format for authors. This will give a more structured manuscript.</p> <p>Yes. Although for a review article, it is expected that at least thirty articles are reviewed.</p> <p>The references are too old. I will suggest the authors consult recent publications (between 2018-2023) in this area. Secondly, I believe the journal has a referencing format? This format should be adhered to strictly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are minor grammatical errors all through the manuscript; making the manuscript difficult to read. The authors could employ the services of a professional/editing software for this purpose.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The figure 1 is not readable. Authors could do well by enhancing the readability of the diagram. It also has no reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The figure 2 has no reference also. -The figure 3 has no reference. Did the authors draw this? If yes, then the name of the software used in drawing it has to be stated. - The figure 4 has no reference also - The figure 5 has no reference also <p>-All pictures and diagrams used need to be referenced. And if drawn by the authors, the software used in drawing has to be mentioned along with its version.</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:	Patience E. Idoga Bakre
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutse, Nigeria