

## Review Form 1.6




Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_84217
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Approach to Reduce Wirebond defects caused by Tight Wire Loop Profile on Ball Grid Array Packages
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fig. 7.2 should be explained.</li><li>In ANOVA test it is said that “there is significant difference ....”  Yet it should be given that how much difference is expected and accepted,  The reason of the difference should also be found and explained</li></ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Thank you for your comment. Fig 7.2 (which is now 7.3) is the cause-and-effect matrix. I will add brief explanation for the reader to understand.</li><li>Thank you for your comment. In ANOVA testing, it is statistically concluded that there is a significant difference if the P value (<i>Prob</i> &gt; <i>F</i> on the illustration) is less than 0.05 which is shown on the illustrations of the ANOVA. In this case, variance compared are the variances of X and Y placement of rotary and fixed bond head respectively.</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>In ANOVA test it is said that “there is significant difference ....”  Yet should be given data of benchmark or standard (if any) so that both the methods may be compared with the standard.,</li></ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Thank you for your comment. Comparison of the 2 characteristics, ROTARY and FIXED bond head is shown on Fig. 8. This includes mean (M), standard deviation (stdev), and process capability (Ppk). Illustrations also show that upon doing statistical testing, which is the analysis of variance or ANOVA shows that FIXED bond head is better than ROTARY bond head that contributed to better performance of looping in Wirebond process as shown on Fig.10.</li></ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Grammatical check should be done in the entire document.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Thank you for your comment. I have revisited the manuscript and corrected some grammars. Thank you.</li></ol>

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> None	Thank you for your feedbacks to improve the manuscript.