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		
Minor REVISION comments	This is a very good idea and design concept to improve the productivity as well as for better quality. Usually conversion package and setup machine are always concern to the machine utilization, Technician ratio and its quality which is related to Technician's skill. This design will help to improve all concern as mentioned. Following are some minor comment; 1) To better understand, please specific or mention this is QFN package which is flat frame and be panel design strip. 2) Would recommend to mention about procedure or instruction on how to use or setup this new anvil block (The augmented anvil block) design such as selection hole by dap size guide line (table) for technician to setup.	Noted. This will be added as part of recommendations. Thank you very much. 1. Noted. Done mention of QFN. 2. Added as part of recommendations. Thank you.
Optional/General 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)*	