

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105430
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Performance Analysis of a Mini Twin-Shaft Shredder for Efficient Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Bottle Recycling in the Philippines
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)	1. The manuscript (henceforth MS) is contributing significant knowledge for scientific community. 2. The title of the article is suitable as per the MS. 3. Yes, the abstract is providing good comprehension of the MS. 4. The subsections and structure of the MS are appropriate. 5. The MS requires some changes to be scientifically correct. The author(s) should attempt the following changes in the MS: a. Very strong arguments are quoted without any citation. For example, "In 2001, the generated amount of industrial and post-consumer waste reached 5,040 metric tons, resulting in a 21% recovery rate of PET plastic waste". Likewise there are many strong arguments in the MS. b. The mathematical representation (formula/equation) to be improved. c. Nomenclature of the data presented in Table 7 is missing. 6. The reference section need to be improved. The section is not in format, please use common referencing style (e.g. APA format).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language used in the MS is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) There may be ethical issues in the MS as the formula/ equation used are not cited properly.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shashank Singh Pawar
Department, University & Country	Goa University, India