Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_85320**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Beverage Coaster Paper - A Protective Paper Grade Development**
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)

Review Form 1.6

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)** In the paper should be added a Nomenclature inside which will be listed and explained all abbreviations, symbols and markings used throughout the paper. **2)** References List – in the List of References should be added recent researches in this research field. At the moment, the Author(s) have dominantly used literature older than 5 or 10 years. A new, recent literature should be added. **3)** Numeration of References in the List of References is not proper – there are two references 1. This mistake resulted in wrong calls on all references throughout the paper text. Therefore, a notable correction is required. **4)** Please, check, correct and unify all calls on the references throughout the paper. Sometimes it is used, for the same reference: [2 Doelle Blottter Paper], in the most of the cases is used only numbers [2]. Please, unify all calls. Also, reference [2] is written by Dölle, not Doelle – so the corrections throughout the paper text are required. **5)** English is good and fully understandable, but it should be improved in some sentences or paper parts. **6)** The Author(s) should better and clearer present used measuring equipment and its properties. **7)** Section 3 – Results and Discussion – first of all, this section is too short, it should be enlarged with more results obtained in the research. Secondly, subsection 3.1 should be presented as an independent title (without numeration) because each section should be divided into, at least, two or more subsections. Dividing of any section to only one subsection does not have any sense. **8)** Section 5 is missing. **9)** At the moment, almost all the figures and paper parts are taken from the literature. In my opinion, this paper is a Review Paper, not Original research article. **Final remarks:** This can be interesting paper, but it should be properly and correctly arranged and more results should be added. Also, scientific novelty and contribution to the research field should be clearly addressed, or this paper can be published, after above mentioned corrections, as Review paper (without clear definition of scientific novelty and contribution to the research field).	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Vedran Mrzljak**
Department, University & Country	**University of Rijeka, Croatia**