



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_59290
Title of the Manuscript:	Physical and Morphological Characterization of Cement Particle for Adaptability to Electrostatic Precipitator Control
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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>1. In the "1.4 Conclusion" section, the manuscript appears as follows: "It is widely established that an ESP.....before their charge become large enough to repel further ions." In the conclusion part, the author should indicate the main research results of the manuscript, not the research conclusions of others. In this part, references should not be cited.</p> <p>2. At the end of the manuscript, the author got this conclusion, "Therefore, considering the conformity of the physical andtraced to other factors." The conclusion should indicate the physical morphological characterization of cement particles, rather than the effect it has on "ESP". Moreover, the final conclusion is that there is no impact, I think it should be studied in depth.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>3. In the "1.1 Introduction" section, the author should focus on the content related to the main part of the manuscript. However, the author has used a lot of space to introduce the performance of "ESP" and the properties of the particles, and these literature reviews lack relevance and disorder, this part should be appropriately deleted.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>4. It would be useful to include photos from the stage of sample preparation for testing in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The width of the SEM image is too large, it is recommended to deal with the normal size.</p>	



[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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhongchang Wang
Department, University & Country	School of Traffic and Transportation Engineering, Dalian Jiaotong University, China