

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_101408</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Application of Recycled Fiber Material from Aseptic Packaging Containers for Paper Board Applications - A Laboratory Handsheet 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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community. It deals with the recycle of material which could reduce the accumulation of solid wastes.</p> <p>Yes, suitable</p> <p>Yes, comprehensive</p> <p>Yes, appropriate</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language / English quality of the article should be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>(1) The authors are requested to check the English quality of the article. Ex., Under the section Introduction, 4<sup>th</sup> Paragraph line number 3, it is mentioned as can contains. It should be corrected as can contain.</p> <p>(2) The last paragraph under the section Introduction, is too lengthier. It could be rewritten.</p> <p>(3) In the section 3.1 Refining, the freeness testing results of refined fibers were compared at different values of beating time (15 min, 30 min). When we compare the values, the specific parameter should be a fixed value.</p> <p>(4) In the caption of figure 5, the description of (a) and (b) is not given.</p> <p>(5) In figure caption 7, the word whiteness is misspelled.</p> <p>(6) Abbreviations of LCB, OCC, etc., are not given in the manuscript.</p> <p>(7) After the chapter 4. Conclusion, references chapter is numbered as 7.</p>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	E. Kavitha
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India