



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_51213
Title of the Manuscript:	Thermogravimetry Analysis of Epoxy and Unsaturated Polyester Filled With Some Agricultural Waste of Dates Palm (<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>) and African elemi (<i>Canarium shweinfurthii</i>) Particulate Composites
Type of the Article	Original research 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>)



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	<p>Line 80 – this line is large as text matter is written in a table form, pl remove the text from the table so that all lines are seen with line numbers.</p> <p>Section 2.3 –authors are suggested to give details/ specifications of the equipment used for the Thermogravimetric Analysis. A reader may be interested to know about this.</p> <p>Line 81- something, may be figure or table is missing. PI take care to check this and add if something is missing.</p> <p>Conclusion: Line 186- Literatures have shown that... Authors have compared the results only with references [8] and [9] both are about 20 years old and not available in the web to check the comparison, what the authors are calming. I suggest authors to cite recent references to strengthen the paper.</p> <p>References: Reference [7]—the reference does not have page numbers etc. Check below is correct: The useful plants of west tropical Africa, Vols. 1-3 1995 No.2. ed. pp.976 ; 648 ; 868 pp. Suggested to add some more recent references</p> <p>After using some recent references, authors are suggested to rewrite the conclusions suitably.</p>	<p>Line 80 has been corrected, lines are now seen with the line numbers</p> <p>Section 2.3 has been taken care of by giving the specification in line 80 where material is listed.</p> <p>Nothing is missing in line 81</p> <p>Reference [3] is cited which is recent.</p> <p>Okay.Corrected.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 15- unusual -- is it unusual? Check spelling</p> <p>Line 19- Temperature is every common keyword. Suggestion—use Dates palm or African elemi, which is more suitable for the work</p> <p>Line 52- Palm date write as Date palm</p> <p>Line 65- Plate 1- write as Figure</p> <p>Line 76- Plate 2- write as Figure</p>	<p>Thanks. Unusual has been corrected</p> <p>Line 19- Temperature is a keyword in the paper. Dates palm and African elemi cannot be used as Keywords for they have appear in the Title.</p> <p>Dates Palm is the correct one.</p> <p>Plates in lines 65 and 76 are best written as plate for they are pictures and not figure. Figures are seen as pictorial representation of data.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Good work.</p>	<p>I appreciate the reviewer for a job well done</p>

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?	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>No ethical issue.</p>