



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_49727
Title of the Manuscript:	STATISTICAL EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT STRENGTH ON MILD STEEL CLADDING WELD METAL GEOMETRY
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Page No. 1, line no. 10, there is two consecutive the words. "the the". One should be removed.</p> <p>2. Abstract is needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>3. In general, an introduction should contain adequate references wherever is appropriate since it gives information form already published articles only. Authors must give references to their contents given in introduction.</p> <p>4. Experimental section should be given clearly.</p> <p>5. Authors should give more care on preparation of the manuscript. I have a doubt whether the manuscript is prepared according to journal guideline or format.</p> <p>6. Titles of sections should be modified more specifically.</p> <p>7. Though, authors done experimental work in a good manner, they have failed to present them in clear form. Authors instructed to give clear insight of results. The present form of manuscript just looking like a progress report.</p> <p>8. Since the journal is more valuable, the manuscript should contain more number of references. I could see very less number of references in the present manuscript. More number of references result more clear projection of manuscript.</p>	Corrected and appraised
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Typo and grammatical errors should be rectified	

### 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)	