

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_88624
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Cause and Effect of Bent Side Rail at in Molding Process
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors have traced the occurrence of bend rail to the interior of the molding machine, particularly on the unloader de-culling area. It was observed that the bent side rail of the strip was caused by the misalignment of the strip with the de-culling module during loading placement. The problem is solved by adjustment on the motor pulse parameter, which eliminates the occurrence of bent side rails.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kindly, define the acronym in the first instance of the introduction;</li> <li>2. The author(s) should enrich the introduction with references;</li> <li>3. The author(s) should specify the molding compound used either as a coded or encoded sample;</li> <li>4. Several process steps (<b>explain the several process steps in detail</b>) prior to singulation;</li> <li>5. The input and output data should be presented in Tables within the text;</li> <li>6. Twelve references were presented, however not cited in the manuscript. Authors should endeavor to cite these references;</li> <li>7. The manuscript is void of data, which could have backed up the investigation.</li> <li>8. <b>The highlights in red should be sponged by the author, whereas those in blue should be retained by the authors;</b></li> <li>9. Notwithstanding, the paper is the methodology of the paper is sound and it tries to solve or eliminate the problem of bent rails during the singulation process.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stephen Ndubuisi Nnamchi
Department, University & Country	Kampala International University, Uganda