

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_95691</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bench scale production of enhanced phenol-formaldehyde (PLGF) adhesive: Effect of lignin-gluten modification</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://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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>This manuscript is quite important for the scientific community, especially regarding efforts to reduce the danger of formaldehyde</b>  2. <b>The title of the article is in accordance with the contents of the article</b>  3. <b>Article abstracts are complete and comprehensive</b>  4. <b>Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate</b>  5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct and follows reasonably well research methods</b>  6. <b>References are sufficient and up to date, but there are still some references that are not contained in the manuscript and vice versa</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of the language/English articles is appropriate for scientific communication and easy to understand	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please improve especially on novelty and research purposes and references. Writing is adjusted to the style of writing in the intended journal	

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

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Sri Hidayati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lampung University, Indonesia</b>