

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_120267
Title of the Manuscript:	Research progress on mechanical properties of modified epoxy resin reinforced by fillers
Type of the Article	Minireview 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reviewer comments</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Research progress on mechanical properties of modified epoxy resin reinforced by fillers</p> <p>The article reviews the effect of nanofillers on the mechanical properties of epoxy resin. It gives a very superficial information with only few articles in the selected area.</p> <p>I found the following shortcomings in the article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The full form of CNF should be given. 2. English is not written properly at many places. 3. Grammer is not proper. 4. The review is not giving proper information, and only few references are taken into consideration. 5. Referencing is not proper (Same format should be followed everywhere). <p>I would like to ask the authors to improve the quality of the article by adding more recent and relevant references. Be careful about the formatting. With the major revisions the article may be considered for publication.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>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.</p>		

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mayank Agrawal
Department, University & Country	IIT, Jammu, India