

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_110288</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Production of Engobe for Ceramic Decoration.</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It is far from scientific framework. The conclusions presented are not supported by any evidence.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. It does not contain satisfactory information about the results of the study.</p> <p>4. Not suitable. Under the title of 2.0.LITERATURE REVIEW "2.1.Introduction, 2.2.Engobe Composition and Ingredients etc." there are unnecessary titles. The difference of this study from previous studies should have been discussed under the heading "LITERATURE REVIEW".</p> <p>5. No. There are no analysis results of the raw materials used under the heading 3.0.MATERIALS AND METHODS. XRF, XRD, Grain size analysis etc. of raw materials. There is lack of information about features such as this raises doubts about how the product was formed. Additionally, the engobe recipe needs to be prepared according to the chemical preparation of the raw materials. Test samples were made one for his prescription. More experiments should be done. Answers to questions are not available in the manuscript as follows: How long does it take to ground in the mill? How much water was added to the mill? What is the moisture content of the raw materials? What is the grain size analysis value of the mixture? Isn't there a problem of thermal expansion difference between engobe and biscuit? What is the oven regime for firing? What was done for the engobe technology test? Has a color test been done? What was the desired outcome and standard? How well was it received?</p> <p>6. No.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The conclusion presented is not supported by any evidence. It is far from scientific framework.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Serhan Haner</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Afyon Kocatepe University, Türkiye</b>