

[Review Form 3](#)

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120448
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF COMFORT PROPERTIES OF MULBERRY SILK AND VISCOSE BLENDED KNITTED FABRICS FOR SUITABILITY IN CLOTHING IN TEMPERATE REGIONS
Type of the Article	ANALYSIS OF COMFORT PROPERTIES OF MULBERRY SILK AND VISCOSE BLENDED KNITTED FABRICS FOR SUITABILITY IN CLOTHING IN TEMPERATE REGIONS

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:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a weak manuscript accord to the mentioned 1. Literature review 2. Methodology 3. Result and discussion please my comments in manuscript step by step	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but not justified with mentioned points in above row.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Not, need to be improved, please see my comments in manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not , need to be improved, please see my comments in manuscript	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Not , need to be improved, please see my comments in manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Not ,very weak references	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Amir Qureshi
Department, University & Country	NED UET, Pakistan