

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Chemical and Materials Sciences: Developments and Innovations</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3683
Title of the Manuscript:	Auscultation Techniques of Constituent Materials of Monuments and Ancient Constructions: Immediate Techniques and Instrumental Techniques
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	I like this manuscript because auscultation techniques play a crucial role in assessing the strength of a structure and determining the necessary measures to safeguard landmarks and other historic buildings. Quick ways to find out what's wrong with the surface and how severe the damage is include looking at it with your own eyes and trying it by hand. Instrumental tests, such as ultrasonic ones, provide more precise and non-invasive insights into internal conditions, identifying unseen damage, holes, or cracks. Together, these methods ensure accurate identification, meticulous restoration, and long-term protection of cultural property.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	SUITABLE	
<b>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.</b>	The statements written in the abstract are generalised so the topics and subtopics (mentioned in the article) can be emphasised shortly in the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Subsections and structure are appropriate, but ground penetrating radar (GPR) can also be mentioned, as this is also an important technique.	
<b>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.</b>	I have checked techniques and methods of examination that are scientifically correct. This script is strong because it deals with the problems of heritage protection in a way that is well-rounded, useful, and technically sound. It stresses both how important early diagnosis is and how important methods are that don't damage fragile old buildings. This makes a strong case for quick, non-invasive action.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	There are a total of 55 references, of which approximately 32 are old (before 2018). There is a need to add more recent references.	

**Review Form 2**

<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. The article requires minor corrections in grammar and spelling(as sulphate is writtensulfate).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend adding a review of additional new techniques to the existing content, along with the latest references.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shelley Oberoi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mumbai, India</b>