

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_68914
Title of the Manuscript:	Epoxy Fillet Height Study of Tapeless QFN Leadframe Package on Different Diebonders
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page (1), Abstract. The abstract did not give well summary of this work. My advice that the author should rewrite the abstract again to Summarize:-               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim</li> <li>• Main argument</li> <li>• Method</li> <li>• What is new?</li> <li>• Simulation and experimental results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The authors should be strongly presented the motivation and the add value of their work compared with state-of-art works.</li> <li>3. Finally, the conclusion was written in a simplified and general way.  The author should rewrite the conclusion again to Summarize:-               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. the main approach.</li> <li>II. Summarize the main findings of the paper.</li> <li>III. Discuss the limitations of the work.</li> <li>IV. Outline future research directions, if possible.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would be good to add a section to present the related works, and not at the introduction.</li> <li>2. Authors presented a weak state of the art review (only 7 references).it would be better if the author add references that are more recent.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author should write the end of introduction as follow " The paper is structured in the following manner: in the section 2, .....; section 3 contains the conclusion ".</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nasar Aldian Ambark Shashoa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Libyan Academy, Libya</b>