



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_47613
Title of the Manuscript:	The Continuing Quest for High Tc – Superconductors: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	<p>In this paper authors have highlighted that the paper attempts to elucidate the technological advantage of superconductors and reflects the notation that chemistry can have a positive impact upon our lives. Firstly, the historical background of superconductivity is presented then the theory of superconductivity and the description of physical and chemical principles upon which it rests is given. Finally, some prospects for the future applications of these new materials are discussed.</p> <p>The study is found interesting and review manuscript is almost structured properly but it needs to be <i>linguistically refined</i>.</p> <p>Following corrections / modifications are required to be done: 7.CONCLUSION <i>Outcome should be written point wise.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The review manuscript has been refined linguistically 2. It is better to write the conclusion part in paragraph normally in research papers.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / 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)	