

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_100799
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH FIBROMYALGIA AT THE CLINICAL SCHOOL OF PHYSIOTHERAPY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GURUPI
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES .It is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes.the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>Yes .the abstract of the article Is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes .subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>Yes . I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>NO.The references are not up-to-date,references of the last 10 years should be cited,please cite last 10 years references ,especially references for the last 5 years.</p> <p><u>Apart from above mentioned 6 points, there are additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p>1.the part of dicussion is not well discussed combined with results and references and should make some modifications and .the part of dicussion should be separated with the part of the results.</p> <p>2.The language is not fluent ,suggesting that it should be edited by an english native editor.</p> <p>3..The conclusion should be concise and only summarize the most important contribution of the research.</p> <p>4.The references are not up-to-date,references of the last 10 years should be cited,please cite last 10 years references ,especially references for the last 5 years.</p> <p>5.The tables should use the format of 3-line table,please revise the format of the tables to 3-line table,especially Table 1-4.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is not fluent ,suggesting that it should be edited by an english native editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Pelase make large revisions, espically in the part of results,discussion ,conclusions, references and languge-editing. After making large revisions,the paper may be considered for publication.</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:	Changping Li
Department, University & Country	Southwest Medical University, China