



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_46341
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Nb-Ni Influence on the Mechanical Behavior in a Cu-Al-Be Shape Memory Alloy
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the introduction it was mentioned that copper based alloys have limited applications due to low plastic property but didn't mention if cu based SMA has better ductility from the results I think 6% is good so authors should mention the enhanced ductility in the introduction as well. 2. the authors should revise the English writing well as there are many problems for example: 3rd paragraph is not clear to understand. and 4th paragraph in introduction it should be Cu–Al–Be SMA presents interesting properties, 3. please revise the Nb percentage as there are a mistake in the chemical composition. 4. in the experimental part the hot rolling was performed at what temperature. 5. authors should mention the linear intercept method standard used to calculate the average grain size. 6. in the hardness results: It is believed that this increase is due to the Nb-rich precipitates increase the rigidity of the material. ?? What is the authors evidence? A reference or microstructure should be inserted to prove this sentence. 7. how many samples used for tensile test and is there repeatability? 8. Alloy 1 in the stress strain curve starts, the strain starts from $\epsilon \sim 3$ which is not correct. stress and strain should start from 0. 9. Again the second paragraph of the tensile results doesn't have any prove. 10. A reference or additional microstructure should be added as evidence. 11. several parts in the conclusion are just mentioning results not as a conclusion. It should be revised again. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Recommendation were accepted and edited 2. Paragraph rewritten 3. Nb percentage revised. 4. the ingots were heated to 850°C at each step of hot rolling (rewritten). 5 The method was succinctly described 6. From the optical micrograph is verified the NB precipitates presence, so the increase of the rigidity is related with this appear as show in other studies. The reference was including at the text. 7. five samples for each alloy, yes there is repeatability. 8. Really, the graph was plot wrong, but we repeat all tensile tests and plot the graph again, starting from 0. 9. We input other references that explain the results. 10. References were added. 11. Conclusion was revised and rewritten.
Minor REVISION comments	Several English writing mistakes need to be corrected.	All text was revised.
Optional/General comments		

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)	There are not ethical issues.