**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 | |

**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 | **The study is good. It is useful and explained in clear terms. It can be further taken up for research.**<br>**However……**<br>• **The term "Rechargeable" relates to "Battery Recharge". The energy source in the Jacket is not from a Battery.**<br>**The Title can instead be, "Development of Reheat -able Thermo Layered Jacket".**<br>**Also**<br>• **The turnitin software showed 62% similarity. The author could look into it and reduce it to about 20%.**<br>• **References need to be as per API format** | 1. The term Rechargeable Thermo jackets was used as the gel can be recharged for its use again and again but if the reviewer feels that the word reheatable is better, I appreciate and have done the needful change in the revised paper.<br>2. As far as plagiarism issue of 62% is concerned, let me assure that it is the original work undertaken by my MSc student. We at Punjab Agricultural University are using the same software Turnitin for checking the plagiarism status of PG research work. So the student's thesis has already been uploaded in the software when it was checked before her final submission. The thesis gets submitted only if the data is under permissible limits of similarity. But, now when it is checked by the reviewer in the same software again, it will automatically show higher similarity due to thesis copy already present in the software.<br>3. References have been corrected in the desired format. |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | None | |
| **Optional/General** comments | Use of English Language in some parts is not very correct. A few sentences here and there may be rewritten. | 1. Needful done. |

**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)* | |
| **If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.** | The turnitin software showed 62% similarity. The author could look into it and reduce it to about 20%.<br><br>The Paper has 62% similarity as per turnitin plagiarism software | |