



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_51111
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Evaluation of the Effect of Process Parameters on the Depth of Penetration of tungsten Inert Gas Arc Cladding Weld in Mild Steel
Type of the 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	<p>Abstract - not clear Introduction is very general writing, there is no introduction to the present research and the aim or objective of the work. The authors need to rewrite this section with proper references. Line 62, Cladding – there is no need of a section for cladding, the authors have written what is there in books, authors can write all about this in introduction section and make the reader understand the objective of the work. Line 80, section 2.3 --- what is Empirical Review? Line 97, design expert version 10.0.1--- pl provide a reference Line 94, Authors need to write which welding machine was used for their work, and what are the specifications. Table no.1. – Authors need to write the units of all parameters used in the table. For example, gas flow rate unit, welding speed unit, etc. Line 103—pl. makes section 4 bold and visible Line 105—why design summary presented as figure, it can be better presented in a Table form. Fonts are small difficult to read. The results represented in the form of several figures need proper discussion. In section 5, after Fig.6, Fig. 17 is discussed. Are other figures not important, the readers need to analyse other results also. References- PI use some more references in the area of this research work to strengthen the paper. Presently all references are general references.</p> <p>I suggest improving the paper, so that a reader can get the clarity of the result analysis of the work.</p>	The needful corrections have been effected.
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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>	