

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_98693
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF SOME ADDITIVES ON THE TENSILE STRENGTH AND YOUNG MODULUS OF EPOXY RESIN.
Type of the Article	Original 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</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>Yes scientific community will be benefitted by the research work.</b></p> <p><b>The title is apt for the work.</b></p> <p><b>The abstract should be more precise and the objective should be mentioned clearly and not the procedure of work only as is mentioned in the abstract.</b></p> <p><b>Numberings are not provided and subsections are of bold and similar size as the section headings. Section headings are also not numbered. Manuscript is scientifically correct but the technical writing and presentation is not so good.</b></p> <p><b>References are enough and good.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language should be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Detail description of procedures with figures, tables and graphs should be provided in the Results and discussion part which is missing which should be provided. No validation is done for the work which is important.	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Debasmita Mishra
Department, University & Country	Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, India