

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96547
Title of the Manuscript:	Nano Fibrillated Cellulose from Recycled Old Corrugated Containerboard as Bio Additive in Board Production – A Laboratory Type Paper Machine Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The research outcome may be helpful to the concerned community but need more detail study with scale up. Yes The abstract is very brief and need to be more comprehensive Yes the subsections are appropriate The research topic chosen in the present manuscript is relevant to the problem as addressed and scientifically correct as per the results and discussion. References are sufficient The result and discussion section is not properly constructed. Insufficient data presentation and lacking of any statistical analysis.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is suitable for scholarly communications?	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript may be published after incorporating the points as review comment.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ranjana Das
Department, University & Country	Jadavpur University, India