

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_115019
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of mechanical properties and corrosion resistance of Al-Zn-Mg alloy with different numbers of flame rectification at 350°C
Type of the Article	Manufacturing and Mechanical properties

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2.yes</p> <p>3.Yes, but elaborate more on the problem statement, findings, and contributions.</p> <p>4.Yes</p> <p>5. It appears that the manuscript outlines a scientifically conducted experiment to evaluate the influence of mechanical properties.</p> <p>6. The references provided in the manuscript appear to cover relevant literature on the topic of Evolution of mechanical properties and corrosion resistance of Al-Zn-Mg alloy, and related areas. However, without access to the full list of references, it's difficult to determine their sufficiency and recency definitively. Here are some suggestions for additional references that could enhance the comprehensiveness of the literature review.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the provided article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear and concise, conveying the methodology, results, and conclusions effectively. However, there are a few areas where improvements could be made for better readability and clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggestion and Recommendation:</p> <p>1. Figure explanation should be clear.</p> <p>2. The conclusion is not clear</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Sivaramakrishnaiah
Department, University & Country	SVR Engineering College, India