

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
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>)

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	<p>Suggest changing 'Blotter paper' to 'Blotting paper', per guidelines in Tappi method.</p> <p>Materials and Methods section is too large with around 2800 words whereas Results & Discussion section is too small with around 800 words only. It would have been more effective if this was reversed.</p> <p>Text highlighted in yellow colour to be checked critically and corrected.</p> <p>Conclusion is not effective and suggest a complete changeover. Most of the components in Abstract and Conclusion are same. Text deleted from Conclusion does not make sense for blotting paper application.</p> <p>Tappi and ISO test methods are not required to mention in References and the reference number to be taken out from the text.</p> <p>Suggest writing all references in the same style following Journal's requirements.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Most of the changes have been provided in the manuscript. Authors are encouraged to see and evaluate.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Vipul S. Chauhan
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	India