

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_97647
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Degrees of Nasal Obstruction and Obstructive Sleep Apnea
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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes, manuscript topic OSA is important to discuss, as untreated OSA can lead to serious complications. There are various subjective methods for assessing OSA risk and causative factors. As the study evaluated the influence of nasal obstruction on OSA by subjective method, so more and more such studies help in checking the reliability of such methods.</b>  2. <b>Title is appropriate.</b>  3. <b>Yes, abstract is short and properly explaining the study.</b>  4. <b>Instead of literature review, discussion should be written after results of study.</b>  5. <b>Manuscript correct</b>  6. <b>Reference number is sufficient and recent references are added by author.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukhpal Kaur
Department, University & Country	Desh Bhagat Dental College & Hospital, India