

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_91084
Title of the Manuscript:	Sociodemographic and Clinical Characteristics of Patients Presenting with Globus Pharyngeus: A Descriptive Cross-sectional Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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>The purpose of this study was to determine the socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients presenting with globus pharyngeus in an outpatient clinic of a tertiary care center of Nepal, which has good practical value. The architecture of this study is largely complete, and I appreciate the authors' contributions. Below I make a few suggestions, hoping to help the author to revise this article more completely.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the "INTRODUCTION" section: The author should state the purpose of the study in the last section. 2. In the "MATERIALS AND METHODS" section: The author described the process of translating the scale into Nepali in the "DISCUSSION" section, as in "GETS is a physician-derived scale for the assessment of throat symptomatology. The original Italian version and Japanese version of the scale have high validity and reliability with a Cronbach alpha value above 0.75. However, in our scenario, the Cronbach alpha value was 0.61, which is poor but acceptable to conduct the study[8,9]. To reduce the biases, the data collection was done by a single physician and the Nepali translation of the original GETS scale tool was done to reduce the language barrier (Appendix 2)." The author can move the above paragraph to the "MATERIALS AND METHODS" section, and please further explain that the scale translated into Nepali had good reliability and validity. 3. The author may further specify the chi-square analysis in the 2x2 contingency in Table 1 to explain the statistical results and important findings. 4. In the "DISCUSSION" section: The authors should elaborate on the practical implications of the findings to demonstrate the contribution of this study. 5. Finally, please revise ABSTRACT according to the revision result. 	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yao-Chung Cheng
Department, University & Country	National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan