

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_100782</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Revolutionizing Nano Materials Processing through IoT-AI Integration: Opportunities and Challenges</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, this manuscript is important for materials science community.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, it needs to be re-written 150 to 200 words and innovation of the manuscript should be included in the manuscript.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The manuscript needs to be re-written with arranging and numbering the sections and subsections appropriately.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the innovation of the manuscript must be explained clearly in both "abstract" and "conclusions" sections of the manuscript.</b></li> <li>6. <b>There are enough recent references in the reference section. However, more recent references may be added to update the manuscript further.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is not clear in the manuscript how the references have been used to write this manuscript as the reference numbers cannot be observed within the body of the manuscript. Manuscript needs to be re-written with employing all the comments provided in this file to be accepted. Therefore, it needs major revision.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ali Anvari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Missouri, Columbia</b>