

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>As per the results and discussion, not much difference/ improvement observed between composite and the alloy. Composite has very little advantage over unreinforced alloy</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Lots of mismatch observed in the graphs. Figure is missing. No discussion on few figures. No uniformity in magnification</p> <p>New stir casting techniques can be explained. Eg: bi stage stir casting</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	To be improved	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	All the comments are listed in manuscript itself. Thorough rereading and rewriting is necessary. Few fig missing. Wrongly cited. Better discussuion required on SEM images. Graphs looks like manipulated. For eg table 3 and figure 7 represents same thing but values are not matching. Except 50N load, all graphs are flat, implies no significant improvement with the composite	

### 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:	<b>Subramanya R Prabhu B</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>MIT, India</b>