

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_83398
Title of the Manuscript:	Blotter Paper for Bench Type Testing - A 48-inch Pilot Paper Machine Production Run
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> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**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 this study, did you use the sizing material in making blotter paper? Because the use of sizing greatly affects the resulting Cobb value.\</li> <li>2. The results showed that the Cobb value on the top side was greater than the wire of the two types of paper. But the results of the study obtained that the porosity on the top side was smaller than the wire side. What causes the Cobb value on the top side (felt side) to be greater than the wire side on the two types of blotter paper?</li> <li>3. Why the Cobb test value of 270 gsm blotter paper was more than 370 gsm while the porosity test results for 270 gsm was lower than 370 gsm?</li> <li>4. Are there any data or references that support the statement: "due to the more compact structure" such as SEM measurement?</li> <li>5. What causes the difference in the smoothness value between the top and the wire side?</li> <li>6. I recommend that data obtained should be analyzed statistically to determine the standard deviation and % variance of each paper test.</li> <li>7. It was not clearly explained why all testing results (cobb, basis weight, tensile, etc) were different between 270 gsm and 370 gsm.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The Material and Method section has not explained how sampling is done, repeated experiment so that research can be replicable and repeatable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the limitations of this research?</li> <li>2. The conclusions have fulfilled the study objectives including how the advanced this research area is and recommendations for future research</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	Muryeti
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	Politeknik Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia