

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_86614
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies of Aluminum and its alloys for sand mould casting Gating System.
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The writing of this paper is quite good and clear. The objectives of the research were achieved. In this paper, the lack of citations and discussions from previous research is unfortunate. Has this research been done before and what is the continuation of the research problem? And if there is a problem in the casting process, a fishbone diagram or root cause analysis (RCA) should be made. When fishbone and RCA are done so that researchers understand what happened. The researcher should measure the percentage of each error so that it can be solved from the existing research problems?	The fishbone diagram is made for the defect analysis of Aluminium 356 alloy and same is added in the revised manuscri
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Citation from the previous researchers Discussions must be carried out on previous research, whether to continue with previous research. Deep analysis about the casting problems with fishbone diagram and root caused analysis method	Modifications are made in a revised manuscript
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This paper only requires minor revisions and can be continued with revisions so as to make this paper bette	

### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	