SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_46830**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Innovative technology of manufacturing of reusable metallurgical equipment with increased operational resistance from the blast furnace cast iron of the first melting**
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)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	**The article: Innovative technology of manufacturing of reusable metallurgical equipment with increased operational resistance from the blast furnace cast iron of the first melting, contains: 8 pages; 9 keywords; 9 figures; 2 tables; 0 equations; 3 bibliographical references.** **The abstract is not completed: the abstract tells the reader: WHAT you did, WHY you did it, HOW you did it, WHAT you found, and WHAT it means.** **I recommend the revision of the English language of the paper.** **Figure 2 has to be replaced with a better figure (that is, a figure designed in known commercial software).** **The conclusions are very short being presented very expeditious without a comparative analysis presented synthetic (tables) or graph (diagrams) of the results obtained through the proposed innovative technology and those of existing technologies.** **The bibliography contains 3 current references (very little for this type of article).**	Thank you for good criticisms! The abstract is supplemented in accordance with the comments of the reviewer. The text of the article is reviewed for grammatical errors. In the Figure 2 there is improved the contrast and the lettering. The conclusions are supplemented by a comparative analysis of the results and novelty. The bibliography is extended by 11 references. NB Deleted parts of the article are highlighted in red.
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)*	