

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_106278
Title of the Manuscript:	A Novel Filter Tundish towards Improving Quality and Yield of steel for Single Strand Slab Casting
Type of the Article	Short communication

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but it should be revised the redaction.	

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is an interesting manuscript about design and engineering of materials focusing in particular in on a novel Filter Tundish towards Improving Quality and Yield of steel for Single Strand Slab Casting. It should be of interest from related Industry using actually this technology. So, please considering the following comments: i) In the Abstract it is not really clear what was proposed and improved. There are issues to improve and clarify in the Abstract such as the following statement "Researchers were tried to developed many Models to predict the transition slab amount with changing different operating parameters so that casting Operators can reduce the amount of transition grade.", Which ones are these parameters? Specify about what are you discussing about.</p> <p>ii) A graphical Abstract is suggested to add for better understanding. Please check Journal format required. iii) Comment about the "Background of the Study". This part add the context of some answers to the previous comments. But the previous mentions should be revised in respective parts as well. iv) About the subsections developed. The titles could be necessities for the author; but it should be added an organization to the text developed slitting the Introduction, with previous results to then develop clearly the knowledge created by the author. So, check the format of the Journal and consider the comments. And check, because the titles are not showing the knowledge developed in the sections; or unless is not giving a logical answer in the way to resolve the objective or aims proposed in the beginning. Vi) And, please check where it was added the objectives clearly stated. Vii) There is missing a conclusion section. Viii) A general suggestion, please revise the article due to it is interesting, and it merits to be published. However, in this manuscript it was not clearly presented in the Abstract, there are not clear aims stated, challenges afforded and it is not well presented reading the sections and subsections titles. However, the information provided is very interesting. So, the manuscript should be revised to then be reconsidered for publication.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Guillermo Bracamonte</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>National University of Cordoba, Argentine</p>