

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_120445
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging Modified Poly(Methyl Methacrylate) (PMMA) Bone Cements for Augmentation of Osteoporosis-Induced Compression Fractures of Vertebral Bodies: Present Status and Future Prospects
Type of the Article	Review 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. Abstract is too vague, especially purpose of the abstract. It must be shorter and more specific. In addition, there are too many abbreviations in the abstract that make reader very tired.	The purpose of the study is finding best PMMA according to literature.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Structure is very poor.	It needs a simple comprehensive easy to understand flow chart diagram instead of large table or in addition to large table..
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Flow chart diagram instead of large table with huge nonsense information, which is not read by reader.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehrdad Bahrabadi
Department, University & Country	Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran