

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_102302
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF PATIENT SATISFACTION AFTER 10 KINESITHERAPY SESSIONS AT DSCHANG DISTRICT HOSPITAL
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript focuses on evaluating the satisfaction rate of patients after 10 physiotherapy sessions at Dschang District Hospital. Assessing patient satisfaction is crucial for understanding the effectiveness of physiotherapy interventions and improving the quality of care provided. The study provides valuable insights into the impact of physiotherapy on various pathologies and the satisfaction levels of patients. Therefore, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it contributes to the knowledge and understanding of physiotherapy outcomes and patient experiences. 2. The title, "Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction after 10 Physiotherapy Sessions at Dschang District Hospital," effectively conveys the main focus of the manuscript. It accurately reflects the study's objective and provides a clear overview of the research conducted. The title is suitable and does not require any suggested changes. 3. The abstract provides a concise summary of the study, highlighting the research objectives, methods, and key findings. It briefly describes the study population, data collection instruments, and analysis methods. However, it lacks specific information on the results obtained and the implications of the findings. To enhance the comprehensiveness of the abstract, it would be beneficial to include a summary of the main outcomes and the significance of the study in promoting physiotherapy. 4. The manuscript follows a logical structure and includes appropriate subsections, such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion. Each section addresses relevant aspects of the study and provides necessary information for readers to understand the research. 5. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct. The study follows a prospective descriptive design, includes a well-defined study population, and employs appropriate data collection instruments and statistical analysis methods. The results and findings are presented clearly, and the discussion provides interpretations and comparisons with relevant literature. However, it is recommended that the authors ensure transparency by providing more details on the statistical analyses conducted. 6. Additional references would strengthen the scientific basis of the study and provide context for the findings. It is important to include recent references that reflect current knowledge and developments in the field of physiotherapy, patient satisfaction, and related pathologies. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications. The text is written in proper English and conveys the necessary information effectively. However, I suggested to do the language and grammatical check for the whole paper.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There are two different types font were used.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Phyu Hnin Hlaing
Department, University & Country	Alumni-Mahidol University, Thailand