



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_46033
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on oxide bonded porous SiC ceramics: Processing, properties and applications
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	(a) Is the subject matter appropriate for the Journal? Yes (b) Is the title reflects the contents adequately? Yes (c) Is the abstract informative? Yes (d) Is there any data which might be omitted? No (e) Any apparent errors of fact or logic? No (f) Any apparent lack of clarity? No (g) Is the conclusions sound and justified? No* (h) Is appropriate reference to previous work given? Yes (i) Is the quality of the presentation adequate? Yes (j) Is the work contains new and original contributions? Yes *There is no conclusion provided, the given summary is very long and not concluded the overall article.	A revised conclusion is provided The comment is appreciated by authors and the summary is revised as conclusion in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript reviews on the processing, properties and applications of oxide bonded porous SiC ceramics. The authors give good introduction regarding the porous SiC ceramics. This manuscript can attract interest of SiC ceramic researchers and it also can enhance the knowledge on oxide bonded porous SiC ceramics.	Agreed
Optional/General comments	I would be glad to recommend the manuscript for publication, however the summary is too long, which should be shortened as review article not as research book.	Following the suggestions of the learned reviewer, summary is revised as conclusion



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	No