

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Chemical and Materials Sciences: Developments and Innovations
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript offers valuable insights into preserving ancient monuments through non-invasive diagnostic techniques. Focusing on methods like drones and thermal imaging addresses critical needs for sustainable conservation practices. It bridges the gap between traditional and modern approaches, providing practical guidance for researchers and conservationists. Its relevance lies in minimising harm to heritage materials while ensuring structural longevity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " <i>Auscultation Techniques of Constituent Materials of Monuments and Ancient Constructions: Immediate Techniques and Instrumental Techniques</i> ," could be more concise. Suggested alternative: " <i>Non-Invasive Diagnostic Techniques for Heritage Preservation: Immediate and Instrumental Approaches</i> ."	
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 outlines the manuscript's scope but could be more focused: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include key findings or highlighted techniques. ii. Avoid repetitive phrases like "Its conservation is vital for its subsistence and durability." iii. Mention specific methods, such as drones or thermography, to provide a clearer preview of the content. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is logical, with clearly defined subsections. To improve clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Distinguish the "Conclusions and Prospective" section to emphasise takeaways. ii. Consolidate overlapping details across sections to avoid repetition. 	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with well-supported methods and practical examples. Its emphasis on noninvasive techniques aligns with current ethical and technical standards. By combining theoretical and applied perspectives, it provides a strong foundation for sustainable heritage conservation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are comprehensive and recent, supporting the manuscript's claims. However, including studies on advanced geophysical methods could enhance its scope.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for academic writing but could benefit from simplifying lengthy sentences and correcting minor grammatical issues. Streamlining the text will improve clarity and readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is informative and relevant, but minor revisions are needed to refine clarity, reduce repetition, and streamline organization. Once addressed, it will be a strong contribution to heritage conservation research.	

[Review Form 2](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arc Tajudeen Olawale Ajayi
Department, University & Country	The Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria