

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>)

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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4. 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>The topic is relevant, but the way the manuscript is written does not highlight this relevance. The study aim and results are not concise with each other. The methods are not clear and the results not appropriately presented. This way, the relevance of that work is not clear.</p> <p>1. No, it is not suitable. Based on the results, the title should be more like "DESCRIPTION OF THE TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH FIBROMYALGIA AT THE CLINICAL SCHOOL OF PHYSIOTHERAPY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GURUPI".</p> <p>Absolutely not. It contains incongruent information and description of methods and results. It should be rewritten based on the suggested modifications on the whole manuscript.</p> <p>2. No, they are not. Methods section contains only one confuse paragraph. There is no discussion in the Results and Discussion section. The Results section is very confuse, the presentation of the results should be revised and redone.</p> <p>3. In the current version the manuscript is very incongruent and misleading, it is not in light with sound scientific good practice.</p> <p>4. The reference list comprises 11 registers. Most of them are recent, but they were used exclusively in the Introduction section.</p> <p>Many comments and suggestions were given within the manuscript at the relevant sections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Should the manuscript be accepted, it must pass a complete revision of the language, grammar and academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction is relatively good, sets up the topic.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valton da Silva Costa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Sao Carlos, Brazil