



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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To improve the quality of the work I would recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Chun Yang</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National Yunlin University of Science & Technology, Taiwan</i>