



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_45817
Title of the Manuscript:	Line Stressing Critical Processes Optimization of Scalable Package Passive Device for Successful Production Ramp-Up
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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) Redraft results and discussions, they are very confusing in current form.	1. Chapter 4 is divided into per critical process (4.1, 4.2, 4.3) results and discussion and then the verification of results with the three critical processes discussed jointly (4.4)
Minor REVISION comments	2) check for linguistic errors 3) check for similarity index, it should less than 10 percent.	2. Done 3. I will let the editor/publisher do the similarity index, as I don't have the tool to check
Optional/General comments	1) Refine English in abstract.	1. Done

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)	