

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_94844</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Recycling of Aseptic Packaging Container for Paper Board Applications - A Laboratory Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In block diagram (Fig. 2) no internal or external screens have been shown except only a single screen, moreover, the under screen pulp only recycle back to LC and Drum pulper only?</li> <li>2. In testing method (section 2.2), particular equipment with its detail description and picture is necessary, but here all are missing including: Paper tensile strength, paper burst strength, tear resistance, brightness and opacity.</li> <li>3. The last para of section 3.1.1, there is no any graphical proof if increasing the concentration of oxone by 2%, it must need justification. How the higher efficient values are achieved, if there is no any graphical presentation.</li> <li>4. It is strongly suggested to make two graphs with cumulative effect of pulp and reject separately for the repulping for 1% Oxone, sodium hypochlorite and without chemical.</li> <li>5. Too lengthy conclusion, it needs to be shortened and well-mannered way to be easily untestable form.</li> <li>6. Better to write the conclusion in bullet form in order to get the idea easily.</li> <li>7. Better to draw a single graph for Time. Temp., and concentration for brightness, whiteness, opacity, roughness etc.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the time in Oven for dry raw material and how much moisture contents of the OD material is?</li> <li>2. In section 2.1 (Repulping Development Procedure) it's really hard to understand the method, must need to paraphrase this section.</li> <li>3. Is the cutting of the raw material done manually or through some device?</li> <li>4. Better to insert names inside the text instead of number.</li> <li>5. Lab scale screening picture with its description is missing in section 2.</li> <li>6. A number of grammatical mistakes exist within the article.</li> <li>7. Reference section seems that no application of ENDNOTE has been used.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must need the English proof reading by an expert.</li> <li>2. A number of spelling mistakes exists throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>3. <b>Extensive research work has been done with in deep details the manuscript has the strong potential to be published.</b></li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Ghulamullah Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Balochistan University of Information Technology, Engineering &amp; Management Sciences (BUIEMS), Pakistan</b>