

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_102732
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of young girls' menstrual attitudes on dysmenorrhea
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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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)

Review Form 1.7

Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)		
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		
<p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this interesting study "The effect of young girls' menstrual attitudes on dysmenorrhea". However, I have some comments and recommendations:</p> <p>Comments: Title:- Is appropriate for the content of the article. Abstract:- Represents a suitable summary of the work. Article content:- The methods and results have been well explained. Conclusions:- Are justified on the basis of the study. Recommendations: Discussion:- Mention the limitations of the study. References:- Stick to the format of the journal. General:- Revise language, grammar and syntax.</p>		

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:	Akmal El-Mazny
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt