

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_96145
Title of the Manuscript:	Tribological Behaviour of Hybrid AA6061/SiC/Carbonized Coconut Shell Nanocomposites
Type of the 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. The scientific content in the manuscript is satisfactory.</p> <p>2. The title of the paper is ok.</p> <p>3. Just in case, the abstract may be extended in context.</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections of the manuscript are suitable.</p> <p>5. Consequently to previous point, the work fulfil the scientific contribution.</p> <p>6. Format of the References are suggested to be modified because the texts are enlarged and difficult to read.</p> <p>Few details in the content are suggested and highlighted. Please see the attached Word document.</p> <p>Marks are highlighted in the attached Word file.</p> <p>In the section Materials and Methods, the stir casting method was omitted, the experimental method should be described. The Figures 7 and 8 are contradictory respect to the effect of reinforcement content on the wear rate. It is suggested the review of the prediction model for Figure 8.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	A minor review on language quality is suggested.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfredo Hernández Herrera
Department, University & Country	National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico