SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_61240**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Die Attach Process Defect Mitigation through Design Improvement on Anvil Block Tooling**
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/journal/10/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	**There are no compulsory revisions needed.**	Thank you.
Minor REVISION comments	There are several grammatical errors related to matching subject and verb tense. The start of one sentence is not capitalized.	Noted. We've done additional checks and proof-reading. Thank you.
Optional/General comments	I enjoyed reading the paper and the authors are doing valuable science. A few items could have added more value to the paper. Showing some production data before and after implementation of the Anvil Block design change is one example. Graphs grab the attention as one reads quickly through journals. The authors state in words defects and which ones can be eliminated with this work. The authors could have created a pareto chart of the typical defects. Then they could have used this chart to highlight which ones could be eliminated using this technique. **. The manuscript successfully discusses the improvement using this new insert concept to enhance the Anvil Block and thus avoid swinging the tool sets between multiple runs. The 20% reduction in cycle time is an important value and worth highlighting to the larger industry. It would have been useful to have shown production data before and after implementation. If that were not possible, then layout a serious of conceptual runs and show how the utilization avoids setups.** **There were a few sections in the paper that I had to read twice to make sure I understood due to grammatical errors. This could dissuade some readers from completing the article. Having it proofread with a few tweaks would solve this**	Thank you very much. We've done proof-reading and added some discussions. Some items will be added as part of recommendations. Thanks again.

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	