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	When reviewing scientific papers for publication, I usually start with a general overview in terms of a structure, abstract, literature review, methodology, findings of the research, discussion, conclusions, as well as limitations of the study. In the assessment of the paper submitted for the review, I specifically focussed on the discussed issues, applied research methods and the scope of analysis of research results, as well as substantive content of the article and its structure. To improve the quality of the work I would recommend: 1. Is there any scientific basis for selecting only 10 experts 2. Whether the 10 tested experts provided professional opinions or suggestions after the test 3. Is there a more intuitive interpretation of the data as to the extent of relief felt by using thermo jacket 4. Please add photos of the test to make it easier for readers to understand the product development process 5. In the conclusion, research limitations and follow-up research suggestions can be added	1. Selection of ten experts was done on the basis of review and pattern of previous studies undertaken in the University where opinion of expert panel was taken. 2. The selected experts provided professional opinion only as most of the respondents selected were amongst their regular patients. So, after the use of developed jackets by their patient(s), the expert panel could provide comparative and comprehensive feedback about the relief reported by their patients which was collected through an interview schedule. 3. Extent of relief as far as pain is considered is a subjective measurement which could be checked relative to pointers like very much, average or not at all. The interpretation based on these aspects is only used as extent of relief cannot be measured statistically. It can be only be felt and described. 4. Few photos have been added for clarity. 5. Research limitations and recommendations for future research have been added.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	