



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50154
Title of the Manuscript:	Designing a New Ergonomic Student Backpack
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>[23] - "relate to this" - I am not sure what that you are referring to, please reword.</p> <p>[48] – you need to define backpack palsy syndrome.</p> <p>[98] – You say max load at 10-15% body weight, but the articles in your introduction seem to indicate problems at that weight. How did you choose 10-15% body weight?</p> <p>[135] – how did you get the average waist size?</p> <p>[170] – how did you get a comfort rating? This should be written into your methods.</p> <p>[176] – how did you measure the feet pressure. This should be written into your methods.</p> <p>[181] – how did you measure whether subjects chose the standard or ergonomic backpack? How did you ensure that the subjects would not be influenced by the fact that they were in a study?</p> <p>The writers seem to have researched the previous work done on backpacks, but they fail to show how their study was performed. Once that information is added, then this paper can be reassessed</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	[72] – this is usually called methods and procedures.	
Optional/General comments	This article could use an edit for English grammar and spelling.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Timothy Hui</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Canberra, Australia</i>