

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_103136
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF PORCELAIN POT MILL FOR PROCESSING CERAMICS RAW MATERIALS.
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:

<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 REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, The experimental details are explained clearly with supporting results. The approach to the problem and experimental studies are reasonable.  Yes  The abstract and conclusion should be more quantitative.  The technical aspects appear to be well done, although I suggest that the Pictorial representation with its corresponding data and some characterisation methods will improve the value of the manuscript.  Yes  More comparison to the recent literature should be provided to demonstrate the main contributions of the present work.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language presentation can be improved further.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>C. Kavitha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dwaraka Doss Goverdhan Doss Vaishnav College, India</b>