

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95625
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing the Level of Anxiety among medical students of the preclinical and the clinical years in Saudi Arabia
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract needs modifications. Some interpretations may be added. Some more details of the methods and results may enhance its comprehension.</p> <p>4. The introduction needs improvements. The study rationale should be sharpened. More details may be added to the methods sections. The same information should not be repeated in the text and the tables. The statistics should be reported following standard guidelines. The discussion also needs modifications. The discussion should generally be started by stating the study objectives followed by the major findings obtained. Then they are interpreted in light of extant theoretical and empirical findings. Novel findings should be highlighted. Interpretations of the results need improvements. Thus, the discussion of the study may be modified to add more interpretations. Some suggestions for future directions and implications for prevention and policy may be added at the end of the discussion.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language editing is strongly suggested.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Essentially, the study topic, its design, methods, workup, and presentations are well presented. The study results can make important contributions to the field of knowledge. As it stands, the manuscript will require major modifications before it is accepted.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Dr. Hari Singh Gour Central University, India