



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_53533
Title of the Manuscript:	Wirebond Process Improvement with Enhanced Stand-Off Bias Wire Clamp and Top Plate
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Optional/General comments	<p>Dear Editor: The manuscript focused on the "Wirebond Process Improvement with Enhanced Stand-Off Bias Wire Clamp and Top Plate". However, this article is similar to the technical report, which is not very interesting and no novel study. Based on above reason, it is recommended to reject it.</p> <p>Sincerely yours.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yuan-Tsung Chen
Department, University & Country	National Yunlin University of Science and Technology, Taiwan