



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_44286
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF CASSAVA CYANIDE ON HEAT TREATED DUCTILE CAST IRON
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 based on '**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 There are NO compulsory REVISION comments, apart from minor grammatical errors highlighted below.	There are NO compulsory REVISION comments, apart from minor grammatical errors highlighted below.	This is a well-researched paper	
Minor REVISION comments Check for simple grammatical errors/omissions, e.g. where you wanted to say "leaves" you said leave (line 5), Line 14 a graphite nodules (graphite nodules) Line 15 PCCL to be described in full first time. Line 31 should read Martensitic and NOT matesitic. Line 67 to read Results and Discussion, Line 104 EDX analysis, There is also need to quantify errors in Table 4, Line 116 (e.g. %). Line 181 diffuaction (diffusion)	Check for simple grammatical errors/omissions, e.g. where you wanted to say "leaves" you said leave (line 5), Line 14 a graphite nodules (graphite nodules) Line 15 PCCL to be described in full first time. Line 31 should read Martensitic and NOT matesitic. Line 67 to read Results and Discussion, Line 104 EDX analysis, There is also need to quantify errors in Table 4, Line 116 (e.g. %). Line 181 diffuaction (diffusion)	The is a well presented and a good paper indeed, well researched. The author should just attend to the minor issues highlighted. The paper is good to go and accepted with minor revision.	
Optional/General comments Similarity Index/ March Overview for this paper is 21 % according to Turnitin plagiarism software. This, however, is acceptable according to the presentation of this paper.	Similarity Index/ March Overview for this paper is 21 % according to Turnitin plagiarism software. This, however, is acceptable according to the presentation of this paper.	The author may wish to reduce the Similarity Index to below 21 %. Otherwise, this is optional and NOT required.	



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>	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	Similarity Index/March overview at 21 % as revealed by turnitin is acceptable. However, the author may wish to reduce it further say to 15 %. This however, is NOT required but optional. Otherwise, the paper is well presented.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vincent Musonda</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Johannesburg, South Africa</i>