SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_51234**
Title of the Manuscript:	**DEVELOPMENT OF RECHARGEABLE THERMO JACKETS**
Type of the Article	**popular**

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	What type of gel was chosen? In this article there is only info that it was obtained from the wholesale market in Delhi. 5 men and 5 women is not a relatively small sample for observation and evaluation? Explain!	1 Details of the gel has been added in the revised paper. 2. Five men and five women were selected on the basis of convenience and availability. Selection of respondents was to be done on the basis of their suffering from multi upper quadrant pains like frozen shoulder, cervical, back pain etc. so, such respondents were hunted through snow ball sampling technique and then many of them were not willing to participate in the study due to paucity of time, lack of interest and so on. The ten who were supportive were finally considered keeping in mind the time constraint for undertaking the study by the student. Moreover, one jacket was developed for male and female respondents respectively and each respondent had to be given the jacket for five days so more sample size was a much time consuming activity which can however be tried if this work is commercialized after its publication.
Optional/Generalcomments		

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)*	