

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_110863</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development of Brewed Tea Waste Reinforced Jute Polyester Composites: Physical, Mechanical, Structural and Thermal Characterizations</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The paper is important for the scientific community however, the paper needs to be improved as the flow of the paper is not clear, and it should be improved.</li> <li>2. The paper's title is fine per the problem addressed.</li> <li>3. The abstract needs to be revised; it should follow the proper structure starting from the introduction, research gaps, methodology, results and concluding line.</li> <li>4. Yes, the structure is fine, but there are some suggestions, like graphical representation is more important to justify the experiments conducted; the paper lacks information about equipment, materials, and lab settings, so please include those and some additional figures of the experimental setup, etc.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound, and the authors have followed proper experimentation.</li> <li>6. The references are relevant and sufficient for the justification.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the paper is well written; however, some improvements are needed to enhance its quality, such as providing a proper experimental setup of the study and the figures and justification. Enhance the flow of the write-up, improve the sections, and overall improve the presentations of the paper.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English language of the paper needs to be improved as it has some grammatical and typographical errors that need to be addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abdul Salam Shah Sayed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ILMA University, Pakistan</b>