

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_113261
Title of the Manuscript:	REVOLUTIONIZING CERAMIC ARTISTRY: HARNESSING THE POTENTIAL OF COW BONE ASH AS A SUSTAINABLE OPACIFIER IN ENAMEL PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>	1.YES 2.YES 3.NO, it can be improved more. 4. a) Calcined bone was milled to finer particles (particle size)? Boiling in water with soda potash? Explain in detail. b) Chemical analysis- Elaborate about the atomic absorption spectrophotometer. c) Insufficient explanation regarding durability test. d) Experimental part can be more elaborative. e) How many samples were prepared and what are the results? (only one experimental sample?) f) Key word: Bio-ceramics- Manuscript has no such terminology. 5. YES 6.More references can be added. To The Editor, Similar article was found in research gate, titled- Developing Ceramic Opacifier From Cow Bone Ash; A Sustainable Utilization In Enamel Production presented at 4 th National Conference of the Academic Staff Polytechnique, Nigeria. DOI : 10.13140/RG.2.2.17688.62729 [Dear editor, please check the DOI and act accordingly]	 3. The abstract has been rewritten to show an improvement 4a.The particle size has been included. "Soda" has been deleted. It was included in error. b. Analysis using AAS has been elaborated c. The durability test was designed by the authors; it was simple as written. d. It has been improved in some parts. However, the research was direct, hence nothing to add. e. Only cow bone was used to produce the enamel, the reason why different composites were not formulated. f. Bio-ceramics has been replaced. 7. More work done has increased the number of references from 10 to 16. The outcome of this research was presented at the stated conference and uploaded to the ResearchGate by the first author. This manuscript has not been submitted for publication or peer-reviewed elsewhere.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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)	