

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12301
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of 3D Printing on the Mechanical Properties FDM Printed Electrical Components.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (<i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i>)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It looks it is a substantial and unique manuscript for the science in its field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate to the content.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract adequately covers the content of the article. There is no need an addition or deletion in this part on my side.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Objectives, methods and results are sufficiently objective. Tables and figures are understandable. Scientific interpretation and presentation are successful.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a research article appropriate to the purpose of the journal. It is scientifically satisfying.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references presented in the bibliography are sufficient. Thank you for your contribution to science.	

Minor REVISION comments	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mustafa Rasit Turgut
Department, University & Country	Marmara University, Turkey