



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_37249
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of an Improved Crucible Furnace using Locally Sourced Materials for Teaching and Learning Purposes in Metallurgical Laboratory
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) In Abstract, "develop an improved crucible furnace" may be changed into "developing an improved crucible furnace". 2) "poor heat sources which contaminates" should be "poor heat sources which contaminate". 3) The paper is more like a proposal style. Consider modifying it into the standard format of a research paper. 4) On line 314, the calculation is wrong. Line 318-321 needs to be corrected also. 5) On line 673, "Pp 783-796" should be "pp 783-796". 6) The same correction is needed on line 661. 7) The section "Discussion" is too short. 8) The conclusion part can be modified to summarize the meaningful results.	The corrections have been made as directed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I accepted all reviewers' results/comments with great thanks. All observations have been noted and taken care of.