



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33261
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Casting Techniques on the Castability of Nickel-Chromium Alloy
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>)



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	A simple and original work has been done. A beautiful and simple language is used in the paper. It can be published after minor fixes to be made.	We would like to thank the reviewer for the encouraging words and your valuable inputs.
Minor REVISION comments	- In the line 37 "However, the same cannot be justified for the base metal alloys, due to lack of literature availability." The highlighted part is a very ambitious sentence. However, if the author is ambitious about that, may continue to use it. - The abbreviations should be understandable. The meaning of abbreviations can be given as a table. In the lines 89, 90, ... ($p < 0.05$), In the line 92, ($n = 15$) In the Table 1, 3 (SD) In the Table 2 (F Value, P Value) - In the Table 2, a number of 0.0175 is marked with aster. The explanation given in the footnote is insufficient. - In the Table 2, in the first column "Main groups x Sub – Groups" is not understandable Graph 1 is not very meaningful; it can be completely removed. However, The author can edit if want to use it still.	- In the line 37 the sentence is corrected as - However, the same cannot be justified for the base metal alloys, as the literatures have suggested the deterioration of their constituents due to recasting. - In the line 89 and 90 ($p < 0.05$) indicates the significance level among the different groups. - In the line 92 ($n = 15$) suggest total number of samples in each group. Eg:-Group 1 (number of specimens ($n = 15$) and 2 (number of specimens ($n = 15$)). - In the line 89, 90 and table 1, 2, and 3 the meaning for the abbreviations is mentioned. Eg: SD: Standard deviation. *$p < 0.05$: suggest the level of significance, F value: suggest the mean variations between or within the samples. - In the table 2 the marked value is explained as: *0.0175: Indicates that there is a statistical significance within the compared sub-groups - The graph 1 is removed as per your suggestion because the table 1 shows the mean and standard deviations for all the groups.
Optional/General comments		