

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_127176
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nonlinear Conductivity Theory Research of Composite Materials</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like this manuscript because it offers a new perspective on conduction mechanisms that helps understand how composite materials can reduce the risk of damage to electrical wiring systems. In addition, this text organizes complex information systematically, making it easier to understand. The discussion regarding the influence of various factors such as filler type, content, and temperature on material performance makes it relevant for further research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It's informative enough, but it could be improved to make it clearer and more interesting.  Maybe: <b>Study of Nonlinear Conductivity Theory in Composite Materials for Electrical Cable System Applications</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract section does not explain the essence of the research, for example the purpose of the research design, research methods, and most importantly what the research results are. so that readers are interested in reading further.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not yet  There are no research methods used in this research which are presented in a special chapter.  the problems raised in the introduction are too old, namely in the 1960s. look for the latest issues on that issue.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work appears scientific and reasonable because it is structured in an academic style and structure that is common in research articles. There is an abstract, introduction, discussion of theory, influencing factors, and conclusions, which are the characteristics of a scientific work. In addition, this manuscript uses references from various previous studies to strengthen its arguments, such as the use of percolation theory, effective media theory, tunneling positioning effects, and electron emission theory. This shows that the author refers to relevant scientific literature and acknowledges the contribution of previous research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most references are from the last 5 years	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Daluti Delimanugari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Yogyakarta Islamic High School, Indonesia</b>