

Peer Review

Review of: "A Review on the Mechanical, Thermomechanical Properties and Crystallinity Aspects of 3D-Printed Nanocomposites Used for Fabricating Electronic/Structural Parts"

Jasvinder Singh¹

1. Punjab Engineering College Deemed University, India

1. The research does not explain why certain nanofillers enhance attributes while others decrease performance; it only offers statistics. In addition to gathered data, a review article needs to include comparative analysis and rationale.
2. The paper does not make it obvious what the research gap is or why this review is necessary. A review article should explain what is lacking from current research and how new study addresses that gap. This is not clearly stated.
3. The scientific principles behind reinforcement, including load transfer models, crystallization effects, interfacial bonding theory, and polymer chain mobility, are not explained in the paper.
4. A review paper should include charts that compare things, tables that summarize things, analytical graphs, or a model of a roadmap.
5. Many tables are long and contain repeated or unclear information; standards and formatting are inconsistent. Some data points appear without proper explanation or connection to the text.
6. The conclusion does not summarize key findings, does not highlight research gaps, and does not provide future directions based on analysis.
7. The paper has grammar errors, formatting inconsistencies, and unclear paragraph flow. It is important that review papers are well-organized and easy to read.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.