

## Review Form 1.7

Newspaper name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript number:	ms_JSRR_102302
Manuscript Title:	EVALUATION OF PATIENT SATISFACTION AFTER 10 KINESITHERAPY SESSIONS AT DSCHANG DISTRICT HOSPITAL
article type	original research article

### **General guidance for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **no** manuscript should be rejected solely on the grounds of '**lack of novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline of the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to access this link:

( <https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	reviewer's comment	author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight this part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their comments here)
<b>Required REVIEW Comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article appropriate?</b> (If not, please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the article summary comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form.</b>  <u>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>1. Yes, this article has relevant information, mainly because it presents research results with human beings.</b>  <b>2. Yes. No suggestions.</b>  <b>3. Yes.</b>  <b>4. Yes.</b>  <b>5. Yes, but it can be improved, especially in the context of the statistics presented.</b>  <b>6. It can improve.</b>	
<b>REVIEW minor comments</b>  <b>1. Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</b>	Can improve.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ronaldo Da Silva Cruz</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Colleges Cathedral Boa Vista RR, Brazil</b>