



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_45533
Title of the Manuscript:	Advanced Multi-layered Thermal Barrier Coatings - An Overview
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	<p>1. The paper is missing the figures reported in the text.</p> <p>2. This paper is confined to a review concerning thermal barrier coating applications. Overall the paper is well written, however, it does not offer a critical value in terms of what is being reported. The materials presented is widely available in the open literature. Its content does not offer much novelty or unique data. It lacks demonstration of critical applications of the coating, its service life, its capability under complex engine conditions, thermal environment, creep and so on. Additionally, it is not showing what is currently out in the filed in terms of testing or applications to actual engine components. These information need to be disclosed to support the newer TBC's and up to date that are being implied in the article.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I feel the paper value is low, it can be considered and revised for a feature article where a stronger support in terms of test data, applications figures and others are included. I do not recommend for publication in its current format, much needed update is needed to make it suitable.	

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:	Ali Abdul-Aziz
Department, University & Country	Kent State University, USA